

The
American Historical Review

THE SPANISH DOLLAR AND THE COLONIAL
SHILLING

THE object of the present paper is to state the results of an investigation of two questions: (1) What ought the Spanish piece of eight to have been, in weight and fineness, according to the mint laws of Spain, when it was adopted into the monetary system of Anglo-America? and (2) what was it in fact by weight and assay?¹

The history which interests us begins with the Ordinance of Medina del Campo of 1497.

The Castilian mark contained 4608 Spanish grains, 3550.16 troy grains, 230.0465 metric grams. The fineness of gold was reckoned in *quilates* (24) and *cuartos* (4), corresponding to our carats and carat grains; that of silver was reckoned in *dineros* (12) and *granos* (24).

¹ In writing Chapter XVIII. of my *Financier and Finances of the American Revolution* (1890), I was brought face to face with these questions, and I found them so difficult to answer, on account of the indefinite, defective, and contradictory statements in the literature, that I was driven to the present investigation, approaching the questions from the antecedent history and the original authorities. The Spanish laws are reproduced in full in Heiss, *Descripción General de las Monedas Hispano-cristianas desde la Invasión de los Arabes*, Madrid, 1865. In regard to the second question, the attempt to reach original authorities has been very unsuccessful. Booksellers at Madrid could not find books the titles of which I found quoted. I caused search to be made amongst the State Papers in London in the hope of obtaining the original report from the mint upon which Queen Anne's Proclamation of 1704 was based, and which would presumably give, in strict technical terms, the result of the mint tests then made. I obtained, however, only another list of the coins with their value in English money, like that given in the Proclamation itself. Noback (*Münz- Mass- und Gewichtsbuch*) must have had in hand some such document as I hoped to get. I have used his statements on the present topic, some of which, contained in the first edition (1858), are omitted in the second (1878). Chalmers (*History of Currency in the British Colonies*, 1893) gives other statements of the first importance for the present purpose, which I have quoted, although even with the courteous assistance of the author, I was not able to reach the original documents. Some perplexities I could not have solved at all without the assistance of his scholarly work.

By the ordinance of 1497 the *excelente* of gold, called "of Granada," was to be 23 quilates and 3 cuartos fine (.989.58), and 65 $\frac{1}{3}$ pieces were to be cut from a marc. The *marc* of silver, eleven dineros and four granos fine (.930.55), was to be bought at the mint for 65 reals and to be cut into 67 reals. The *real* was, therefore, 3.433 grams gross and 3.194 grams fine.¹ It consisted of 34 *maravedis*. The *excelente* was rated at eleven reals and one maravedi, the intention evidently being to rate the metals at 10 to 1. The real was not a new denomination. There had been such a unit since 1369, being one seventieth of a base mixture of one marc of silver and three marcs of copper, and the maravedi, or thirty-fourth part of this, had been the current unit of account. After 1497 the real became the unit of account and the maravedi was defined as a fraction of it.²

The great purpose of the reform of 1497 was to escape from this base money and to introduce a good system. It was undertaken entirely independently of the discovery of America and the new supply of the precious metals. The place at which the Ordinance was dated shows that it was a financial reform in the interest of the great money fair of Medina del Campo. A third species of coin was, however, provided for in that Ordinance, perpetuating the coinage of "*vellon*,"³ and probably intended for petty transactions. Seven granos of quality, that is 112 grains of weight in silver, were to be mixed into a marc of copper and the mass was to be cut into 96 maravedis. The later writers affirm that, if a man had one marc of these coins, he had the same value as if he had 96 maravedis in silver coin.⁴ This enigmatical assertion is explained by Mariana to the effect that such a person would have 51 (56?) maravedis in plate (the maravedi in silver being 2.02 Spanish grains in weight), and the copper, and the labor, which last exceeded 40 maravedis, so that, as he says, the value was fairly accounted for. A maravedi vellon was 2.4 grams, of which about .05 gram was silver. There was, therefore, a complete system of trimetallism, for, since in 1566 it was ordered that vellon should be coined only by royal license, in order not to issue it beyond the needs of trade,⁵ there must have been an open mint for it, as for gold and silver, from 1497 on.

¹ The metallic equivalent of 14.138 cents in the fractional coinage of the United States.

² De Cantos Benitez, *Escrutinio de Maravedises y Monedas de Oro Antiguas*, Madrid, 1763, p. 83.

³ The name may be derived from the French *billon*, or from the sheep-skin depicted on the coin.

⁴ Mariana, II. 577; Cantos Benitez, 84.

⁵ Heiss, I. 326.

During the sixteenth century the amount of silver in the vellon coins was steadily diminished. At the beginning of the seventeenth century they consisted only of copper.¹ The vellon real therefore became the money of account. Its debasement and the incredible confusion of the laws about coinage in the seventeenth century are amongst the chief causes of the decline of Spain.² We have to take notice of this debasement, however, for our present purpose, only so far as the presence of a debased coinage by the side of the silver affected the latter.

Under the law of 1497 pieces of eight reals were coined. These, says Heiss,³ "are the first *pesos* which were coined in Spain. Their intrinsic value has continued to be almost the same until our time. They were known afterwards as *pesos*, *duros*, *duros fuertes*, *thalers*, *dollars*, and *piastres*, and were destined to serve as universal money." The weight of such a piece of eight reals, by the law of its origin, was 550.2088 Spanish grains, 423.716 troy grains, or 27.468 metric grams, .930.55 fine. The pure contents would be 394.2889 troy grams, and the equivalent in English silver coin 55.05 pence.

The Bohemian *Joachimsthaler* (whence "dollar") were made from 1517 on. Each was one-eighth of a marc of Cologne (233.855 grams). In 1566 the fineness was reduced to 14 *loth* 4 *grän* or eight-ninths, so that the pure contents of a thaler were 25.998 grams or 401 grains.⁴

In 1600 and a few following years coins were made in England, for export by the East India Company, corresponding in weight and fineness to the piece of eight, but with other marks.⁵ The purpose was to get the use of coins of an established weight and fineness, yet not contribute to the renown of the King of Spain by spreading coins which bore his marks.

It is a remarkable, and should be an instructive fact that the Spanish monarchs of the sixteenth century, who ruled despotically over wider dominions than any mortals had ever ruled over before, who were masters of both the Indies, and possessed all the chief territories from which gold and silver were obtained, were always in financial embarrassment, and that, in 1577, the great money fair of Medina del Campo, the grandest financial institution which Spain ever possessed, was ruined by the act of the king in appropriating the funds

¹ Mariana, II. 581.

² Colmeiro, *Hist. de la Econ. Polit. en España*, II. 489.

³ I. 137.

⁴ Zedler's *Encycl.* art. Thaler. Chalmers cites the law of 1566 as fixing the fineness at .875, which would bring the thaler very close to the piece of eight as prescribed in 1497.

⁵ Ruding, I. 353.

of the bankers and suspending their payments. He was a great king and his was a "great country." He could pay back the money, but he could not restore the credit.¹

This course of events, with the progressive debasement of the coinage, called out a large number of writings about the paradoxical effects of winning the Indies, and about the decline of a monarchy which was, according to the current economic theories, under axiomatic conditions of wealth and prosperity. Religious and other prepossessions rendered this literature for the most part futile, but the writings of Juan de Mariana form a striking exception. He was born in 1536 and died in 1623. He was a Jesuit and a Counsellor of the Inquisition. A collection of seven tracts by him was published in 1609.² One of these dealt with the debasement of the coinage. In the copy of this book in the Boston Public Library, that tract is entirely wanting, and a clumsy attempt has been made to conceal the excision of its title also from the list, on the title-page, of the tracts which the volume should contain. This is proof that the tract later fell under condemnation and that an attempt was made to put it out of existence. The works of Mariana, however, constitute two volumes in the *Biblioteca de Autores Españoles*. His doctrines of civil liberty and political economy are, in general, such as would befit a free-thinking French abbé of the last quarter of the eighteenth century. He maintains that the king cannot raise or lower the coins without the consent of the people; money has value (1) on account of its weight, fineness and workmanship, and (2) by law, that is, the king may rate it just as he may other commodities; there is great gain in coining *reals vellon*, since they no longer contain any silver, therefore they will be counterfeited; in spite of the law no one will give more for a coin than its intrinsic value; as money falls prices rise; money, weights and measures are the bases of all transactions, and must be firm like the cement in a building; debasement is like drink given to a patient out of season, it is refreshing at first but then comes more pain; silver is at a premium in *vellon*.³

The premium on silver was not acknowledged by anybody, for it fell under the condemnation of usury and was both heresy and crime. However, from 1625 to 1686, a premium of ten per cent. was recognized and came to be lawful, although it was far below the truth. The tendency of the departure between silver and *vellon* was to encourage a depreciation of the former.

¹ *Coll. de Doc. Inéd. para la Hist. de España*, XVII. 541; Ehrenberg, *Das Zeitalter der Fugger*, II. 205 seq.

² Joannis Marianae *Tractatus VII.*, Colon. Agripp., 1609.

³ Mariana, II. 577.

The earliest datum¹ yet found for the actual weight and fineness of the piece of eight by mint test is of 1626, when the coin is reported to weigh 420 grains; standard, .925 in some cases and in others .916.66, so that the pure contents were 388.5 or even 385 grains.² The equivalent in sterling silver coins would be 54.25 or 53.761 pence.

In 1642 the real was, by law, diminished in weight, the fineness remaining the same. Instead of 67 reals, $83\frac{1}{4}$ were to be cut from a marc. Two of the latter were to be taken for mint charge as two of the former had been. The old piece of eight, if of full legal weight and fineness, was equal to 9.94 reals of the new type, but the eight real pieces of the old type, which continued to be coined in America, were rated at ten of the new reals. This enactment seems to have left little trace in the history, the explanation of which fact we may find in the figures just given. It was easier to pay debts in the old coins rated at ten reals than in the new ones. In so far as the old coins had deteriorated in weight and fineness below the legal standard, this advantage was increased. One-tenth of a current piece of eight in 1626 was 38.85, or 38.5 grains of pure silver. A real of 1642 was 39.68 grains. The only actual effect of the act of 1642 was to rate the current old piece of eight at ten reals instead of eight, that is, to scale down debts, in silver, one-fifth. Probably the usual money of account was vellon which had depreciated much more, but over a long time, and the motive of the act was to scale silver so as to get it into use again. The only motive ever stated was to prevent the exportation of the coin by foreigners,³ which is, in fact, the same motive, only stated, as so often in the history of coinage, in a way to appeal to popular prejudice instead of in a way to avow the truth.

The mint of Peru had not produced correct coins. In 1650, it was ordered that all Peruvian coins in Spain should be taken to the mint and recoinced and they were denied currency in Spain. New coins of Peru were described, however, in an ordinance of 1653, bearing pillars and "*plus ultra*," which were approved and allowed currency. The work of the Peruvian mint soon deteriorated again and it was very variable. Debased Peruvian coins had wide cur-

¹ Spanish coins current in England in 1613 were "clipped and impaired" one-third part; Ruding, I. 370.

² *Cottoni Posthuma*, Report of the Committee appointed by the Privy Council on the Proposed Enhancement of the Coins, 296.

³ Heiss, I. 186. The prohibition of the export of precious metals was repealed, in England, in 1663, because "it is found by experience that they are carried in greatest abundance (as to a common market) to such places as give a free liberty for exporting the same;" Ruding, II. 11. The prohibition was restricted to English coin.

rency in Europe and America and they produced great trouble. They were a convenient means of fraud by those who knew on those who did not.

The insane coinage legislation of the seventeenth century lies beyond our present purpose. It was chiefly domestic in its scope, although the peninsular coins found their way abroad and were used fraudulently, just as the Peruvian coins were used, under cover of the prestige of the "Spanish piece of eight." As to the domestic effect, suffice it to say that it is impossible to understand how commerce and industry could go on. We have no information as to the devices by which the public escaped the law. Obey it they could not and did not. The most tyrannical measures were adopted to enforce the trimetallic system with one kind of currency in it which was arbitrary, viz., the vellon or copper. In 1652 it was ordered, by decree, that there should be no discrimination in value or estimation of coins nominally equal, nor any premium for exchanging copper and silver coins of the same denomination, nor any interest rates of any kind demanded or paid between sorts of coin. In 1680 elaborate tariffs of prices, freight rates, wages, etc., were published, wherein the attempt was made to accomplish the same purpose by imposing rates for all kinds of contracts which social activity calls into being.¹

All these attempts failed. In 1686 a grand reform of the coinage was undertaken. A premium of 50 per cent. on silver over vellon of the same denomination was recognized, and the purpose was so to reconstruct the coinage as to incorporate this premium in the system. Eighty-four pieces (reals) were to be cut from the marc of silver of the ancient standard (.930.55), of which 82 were to be restored to the owner of the metal, or 83 if it was, when offered, on the standard. Seignorage was declared abolished, so that this mulct stands as true cost of coinage.² The piece of eight of this coinage, now called an *escudo* and consisting of eight times the real, would weigh 337.96 troy grains; 314.5 fine; that is, its weight was to that of the coin of 1497 as 8 to 10.³ It was rated by this law at fifteen reals vellon instead of ten (the "ten" being a survival of the law of 1642) in order to take in the 50 per cent. premium on silver. Fifteen reals vellon were 510 maravedis vellon. Inasmuch as this number was not divisible by eight without a fraction, a second

¹ Cantos Benitez, 137.

² All mint charge on standard metal had been abolished in England in 1666; Ruding, II. 12.

³ Cantos Benitez (p. 138), says that it had lost one quarter. As it never was coined up to standard fineness, his statement, if referred to the fine contents, would be very nearly correct.

law, a month later, added two maravedis vellon to the rating of the escudo. One-eighth of 512, or 64 maravedis vellon, were therefore the equivalent of one real silver, while the real vellon still contained 34 maravedis vellon, the ancient traditional number. The premium on silver, however, was not in truth 50 per cent. It was 80 per cent.¹ Therefore the legislation of 1686 was fruitless and the real vellon continued to be the sole money of account. The largest coin of vellon was the quarter-real, rated at about three cents, money of the United States. The rating of gold to silver was 16 to 1. "This high price keeps their gold at home in good plenty, and carries away the Spanish silver into all Europe, so that at home they make their payments in gold, and will not pay in silver without a premium. Upon the coming in of a plate fleet the premium ceases, or is but small, but as their silver goes away and becomes scarce, the premium increases and is most commonly about six per cent."² This statement no doubt refers to international payments, the vellon being the domestic currency. In 1737 the number of maravedis vellon to a real was increased to 68, so that the real silver (*real de plata* or *real de plata provincial*) was just double the real vellon.

Turning now once more to such information as we possess about the mint tests of the piece of eight, we find in Noback³ the facts given in the first two columns of the following table, being the result of tests at the English mint in 1703. The third and fourth columns are now added.

	Weight in grams.	Fineness.	Fine contents: troy grains.	Metallic equivalent in silver pence sterling.
Seville piaster	27.215 ⁴	.920.833	386.75	54.0056 ⁵
Seville, new plate	21.772	.918.750	308.68	43.149 ⁶
Mexican	27.122	.920.833	385.41	53.82
" pillars	27.021	.925	385.71	53.86
" hemispheres	26.982	.906.250	377.34	52.69

Chalmers's table⁷ presents the following additional data from English mint tests, the value in sterling alone being now added.

¹ Cantos Benitez, 138.

² Sir I. Newton's Report of 1717; *Parl. Hist.*, VII. 526.

³ First ed., 447, 1061.

⁴ 27.216 grams = 17½ pennyweights.

⁵ This is the nearest coin in all the lists to one exactly worth 4s. 6d. sterling and having a gross weight of 17½ pennyweights.

⁶ The peninsular coin of 1686.

⁷ Page 402.

		Weight in grams.	Fineness.	Fine contents; troy grains.	Metallic equivalent in silver pence sterling.
1702	Seville piece of eight	27.21	.919	385.9	53.88
1704	" " "	27.21	.921	386.8	54.012
"	Mexico " "	27.21	.921	386.8	54.012
"	Pillar " "	27.21	.933	392.	54.7387
"	Peru " "	27.21	.905 (?)	380. (?)	53.06 (?) ¹
1717	Seville " "	27.21	.921	386.8	54.012
"	Mexico " "	27.11	.921	385.4	53.816
"	Pillar " "	27.03	.925	385.7	53.85

A scrutiny of the above tables shows (1) that the mints had not worked up to standard and that there was a great variety in their products; (2) that the "piece of eight," when Queen Anne's Proclamation of 1704, which aimed to make that coin the unit of the monetary system of the colonies, was issued, was not a definite unit; (3) that when the Proclamation specified a coin weighing $17\frac{1}{2}$ pennyweights (27.216 grams) and worth 4 s. 6 d., as the true piece of eight, that specification was not warranted by facts. A coin weighing $17\frac{1}{2}$ pennyweights and worth just 4 s. 6 d. would contain 386.694 troy grains fine contents and would be exactly .920.7 fine. It was universally taken for granted, however, in the colonies that "Spanish plate" was on the sterling standard (.925). A coin weighing $17\frac{1}{2}$ pennyweights and .925 fine would be worth 4 s. 6 d. 1 f. Hence such a coin corresponded to the interpretation of "proclamation money," but no such coin had existed since early in the seventeenth century. Full weight dollars were all culled out of the circulation a little later², and probably even as early as the time of the Proclamation, because the East India Company paid a premium of two pence per ounce for them for its transactions. All the current pieces of eight and fractions current in the colonies were clipped. In New England this had been carried so far that the money of account was pieces of eight at 15 pennyweights, and at Philadelphia the money of account was pieces of eight at 12 pennyweights. Scarcely a dollar could be met with which weighed $17\frac{1}{2}$ pennyweights.³ In the proclamations about coins in Ireland in the last third of the seventeenth century, which are the models on which Queen Anne's Proclamation for the colonies is constructed, the piece of eight is always put at 17 pennyweights.⁴ In 1667, pieces of eight were bought and imported by the goldsmiths of London at 4 s. 3 d. each.⁵ If of sterling fineness, they would weigh $16\frac{1}{2}$ pennyweights.

¹ *I. e.*, so variable as not to be quotable.

² Franklin and Hall, *Votes and Proc. H. R. Penn.*, II. 348.

³ *Doc. Hist. N. Y.*, IV. 1118.

⁴ Ruding, II. 19, 23, 39, etc.

⁵ Ruding, II. 13.

The Proclamation was, therefore, most unskillfully adjusted to the facts of the case it had to deal with. It greatly increased the burden of debts. The Lords of Trade knew that it would have some effect of this kind, and they considered the advisability of excepting previous contracts, but took no action, perhaps because there had been a steady depreciation by clipping, with advantage to debtors, for twenty-five years.¹ Either they did not know that the enhancement would be in New England $16\frac{2}{3}$ per cent. and in Philadelphia nearly 50 per cent., or they had little statesmanship to imagine that their measure would succeed in the face of such facts. The Proclamation was complained of in the colonies as confusing, unintelligible, wrong-headed, and it, as well as the Act of Parliament of 1708 to enforce it, remained without effect at the time and for the immediate purpose.

The manufacture of coins by mill appears to have been introduced at the peninsular mints about 1660,² when vellon coins called *moneda de molino* first appear. The silver coins of the sixteenth century bore an irregular row of dots. At the beginning of the seventeenth century these began to be arranged in a true circle, and the circular outline of the coin was made more accurate. The gold coins led in these improvements, the circle of dots (*cordoncillo*) being carried closer to the edge. The silver coins followed in a course of steady improvement in these details, but the piece of eight does not show a true and firm outline until 1709.³

Another general reform in the Spanish coinage system was undertaken in 1728. The law began by saying that the mints had not worked up to standard and that the coins made in the Indies were not milled. Both gold and silver coins were now to be made .916.66 fine, like those of the neighboring countries, in order to prevent exportation. The allowance for error in fineness was set at 2 granos, that is, the bottom limit of fineness was set at .909.722. It was expressly provided that this should be a limit of toleration of error in workmanship and not a standard of perfection beyond which the mint should not try to go. Sixty-eight reals were to be cut from the marc of standard silver. The act also declared that there had been imperfections in the assay of bars from the Indies. Care and diligence were now enjoined, and bars were to be exactly marked according to assay. Technical rules of assay were added.

¹ Penn and Logan Corr., I. 209.

² The milling process was introduced in England about that time; Ruding, II. 7. A "mill and screw" had been tried there a century earlier; Ruding, II. 342, 345; Hawkins, *Silver Coins of England*, 301.

³ Plates in Heiss.

Under this law a real should have weighed 3,383 grams as produced by any mint under the Spanish crown; a piece of eight should have weighed 27.064 grams, or 417.65 grains troy, 382.85 grains fine, worth in sterling silver coins 53.46 pence. The mint price of standard silver was eight dollars per marc, and the marc was cut into eight-and-a-half dollars. The mint charge was therefore doubled.¹ A test of these coins in 1765 is reported² as showing a gross weight of 26.983 grams, fineness .906, pure contents 377.4 troy grains. The value in sterling silver coin would be 52.7 pence.

In the absence of definite information when milled pieces of eight began to be coined in America, we may assume that it was at this time. Although the Proclamation of 1704 and the Act of Parliament of 1708 defined the piece of eight as above stated, contracts could be and were solved at all times by the payment of the current "milled" dollars by tale. Consequently all fees, contracts, prices, and also all rates of exchange, conformed to the facts of the weight and assay of all milled dollars as just stated after 1728, and whenever Proclamation Money was referred to, this is what it was in fact. In New England, "Proclamation" was often further defined, in statutes, as 6 s. 8 d. per ounce, sterling standard, which was the pine-tree shilling rate, and far above Proclamation, but in practice a Spanish piece of eight always was a discharge for 6 shillings colonial, whatever the laws might say. Seventeen-and-a-half pennyweights worth 4 s. 6 d., put for 6 shillings colonial, gave 386.694 grains pure silver as 6 shillings. The same amount, assumed to be sterling fine, gave 388.5 grains. At 6 s. 8 d. per ounce, 6 shillings colonial would be 399.6 grains of pure silver. As we have just seen, the milled dollars of 1728 and the following years were down to 377.4 grains fine contents. This last was, therefore, the definition of the ultimate money of reference, 1728-1772.

The next change in the Spanish laws was in 1772. The provisions of the law of that date are given in the following paragraph, with some very welcome elucidations. "The Mexican dollar still retains (practically) the legal weight and fineness assigned in 1772 to the earlier Spanish dollar, the standard weight being 27.073 grams and the millesimal fineness being .902.7, but the common system of coinage is to allow 263 grams of alloy to 2444 grams of fine silver and to coin the total gross weight of 2707 grams into one hundred dollars. Consequently each dollar is coined to weigh 27.07 grams (or 417.75 grains), and to have a fine content of 24.44 grams (or 377.13 grains), the fineness being .902.844 *per*

¹ Arguello, *Mem. de la Acad. de la Hist.*, VIII. 13.

² Chalmers, 409.

mille, but the fineness stamped on the dollar is .902.7 or 10 din. 20 grs. in earlier fashion. Apparently the difference between the old Spanish and modern Mexican standards of weight arises from the fact that the Castilian marc, as used in Spain, was a small fraction lighter than the marc used in Mexico."¹ The dollar of 1772 was equivalent, if it was conformed to the law, in sterling silver coins, to 52.66 pence; in the federal dollar of 1792, to \$1.016. Assays made under the direction of Robert Morris, in 1782, showed that the pure contents of the dollar tested were 373 grains.² Hamilton, in 1791,³ found that the assays varied greatly. The coin which he thought best had 370.933 grains fine contents. Noback⁴ says that, by an actual test, Spanish dollars coined before 1848, taken in great numbers, show an average of forty-one and three-fifths pieces per kilogram fine, or 24.038 grams (370.95 grains) fine each. The metallic equivalent in sterling silver would then be 51.8 pence and in federal dollars \$0.9992.

If we disregard the laws of 1642 and 1686 as domestic only, the dollar, as a world-coin, fell, between 1497 and our own times, according to actual tests (assuming that it started in 1497 at the standard of the law) from 394.29 grains of pure silver to 370.95 grains, or 5.9 per cent.

The pieces of eight were introduced into the colonies by commercial intercourse and custom. At different times and in different colonies they were rated differently in the traditional denomination "shillings," the motive being the belief that, by rating them at more shillings, they could be drawn away from neighboring colonies. This strife between the colonies is alleged in the Act of Parliament to enforce the Proclamation⁵ as the motive for the Act, and it is to be found adduced as a motive for legislation in a document signed by Sir Isaac Newton with others.⁶ It was a current notion of the period in Europe. Of course the rating of the dollar in shillings in any colony served only to define a shilling in the money of account of that colony, it being agreed or ascertained what was the weight of the piece of eight then current there; in other words, how much the current dollar had been clipped there at the time of speaking. This definition did not depend upon the *average* weight of the current coins, but always approximated closely to the worst of them at a given time, for the clipping went on faster as it became worse, and

¹ Chalmers, 393.

² *Dip. Corr. Rev.*, XII. 93.

³ *American State Papers*, folio, Finance, I. 91.

⁴ Second ed., 565.

⁵ *Stat. at Large*, III. 593; 6 Anne, c. CXXX.

⁶ MS. Report, Dec. 19, 1703.

its tendency was discounted. Another fact which must never be forgotten was that there was another money of account, in each colony, by the side of the silver coin, viz., the barter currency. A barter currency is capable of almost unlimited and steady depreciation. As it depreciated, it forced further depreciation of the silver which otherwise could not exist by the side of it. By a kind of paradox, it was not until paper money had been used to excess, so that the unit from which it started was entirely lost, and there was freedom to select any unit as a new point of departure, that recourse was had, in New England, to the Proclamation money. At its promulgation the Proclamation, like every other act of the home government which the colonists did not like, was nullified. It did not introduce the dollar and did not define it, yet, when all other standards and definitions had been lost, it furnished a standard of reference (not simple and definite) which was taken as a new point of departure, or as a common term in the midst of confusion, discrepancy and doubt.

If six colonial shillings were a dollar, twenty shillings, or a colonial pound, would be $3\frac{1}{3}$ dollars, whatever the dollars might be. If the dollars were each equal to 54 pence sterling, each one would weigh 418.0603 grains sterling, and one pound sterling would be four and four-ninths dollars. If then the dollars in which the colonial shillings were reckoned were the same as the latter (418 grains), a pound sterling was four-thirds of a pound colonial, or exchange was at $133\frac{1}{3}$ when it was at par. Just in so far as the current dollar in any colony was below 418 grains the "par" of exchange rose, and when it had stood for some time at any point, habit caused that point to be regarded as the just and true rate of exchange. In 1700-12, in New England, silver was at 8 shillings per ounce, which meant that the current piece of eight, assumed sterling, weighed 360 grains. Par of exchange was about 155. After 1728 the true metallic par was 136 (with minute fluctuations according to the workmanship of the Spanish mints) if reckoned, as it usually was, in the new milled coins. We can well understand, therefore, the difficulty experienced by the American statesmen after the War of the Revolution in ascertaining what a dollar had been. The Board of Treasury, in 1786, proposed a dollar of 375.64 grains fine, and they found that the ratio of the metals was 15.6 to 1.¹ Hamilton thought that it was 15 to 1. It probably was about $15\frac{1}{4}$ to 1, silver being a little lower here than in England. The most valuable and important statement in Hamilton's report on the mint² is that, in the confusion of the war period, which

¹ State Dep. MSS., Bd. Treas., No. 139, 131.

² *American State Papers*, folio, Finance, I. 91.

affected paper, silver, and gold, a dollar had been 24.75 grains of pure gold. At $15\frac{1}{4}$ to 1, this would correspond to 377.43 grains of pure silver, which, as appears above, was very close to the proper legal contents of a Spanish dollar by the law of 1772. Hamilton, assuming the ratio to be 15 to 1, derived from the "ideal" gold dollar his silver dollar, $371\frac{1}{4}$ grains fine.

Evidently it was a great evil that the coin of reference, or of account, as the case might be, was manufactured by a foreign mint, which did not work accurately, but could not be controlled by those whose interests were most affected. If the English authorities had established a mint in the colonies,¹ that step would have served their purpose much better than what they did, and it would also have tended against paper-money, which the Proclamation certainly tended to encourage, by its confused and complicated bearing on the facts of the case.

W. G. SUMNER.

¹ A proposition to set up a mint was one of the immediate incentives to the policy of the Proclamation; Ruding, II. 59.

THE EXECUTION OF THE DUC D'ENGHIEN

I.

IN September, 1802, after the peace of Amiens and the consequent disbandment of the army of Condé, the Duc d'Enghien, the last male descendant of the Bourbon-Condé family, came to Ettenheim near the Rhine to live.¹ His reason for choosing this village was that he might be with the Princess Charlotte de Rohan, whom he had met there in 1795 and with whom he had fallen in love. "No one," he wrote in 1799, "could be more lovely, more tender, and more constantly perfect in every way."² They were probably married privately toward the end of 1802, by her uncle, the Cardinal de Rohan, just before his death.³ The house which the Duc rented at Ettenheim was small but comfortable; he was obliged to live very economically, for he had scarcely anything except the pension which England had finally consented to give him, the first payment of which was made in August, 1802. Around the house was a garden which he had laid out and in which he delighted to work with the two or three friends who remained with him. The occupation of which he was most fond was the chase, for there was fine hunting in the neighborhood and especially in the Black Forest.

In the early part of 1803 a rumor gained credence in England that the Duc d'Enghien's boldness and rashness had got the better of his reason, and that he had entered France as far as Strasburg several times, and had even had the folly to go to Paris. This rumor is important because, although wholly false, it reached the ears of Bonaparte later, was believed by him, and thus became one of the several coincidences which were to result fatally for the young prince. Believing the rumor, the old Prince of Condé wrote severely to him on the 16th of June, 1803, "You must admit it was useless to risk your liberty and your life Your position may be

¹ Louis-Antoine-Henri de Bourbon was born at Chantilly, August 2, 1772. His father, the Duc de Bourbon, son of the Prince de Condé, was an eighth cousin to the kings Louis XVI. and Louis XVIII.; had he outlived his father and grandfather he would have been the tenth Prince de Condé.

² Letter of the Duc d'Enghien, April 1, 1799, quoted in *Les Dernières Années du Duc d'Enghien* by Boulay de la Meurthe (Paris, 1886), p. 9.

³ Welschinger, *Le Duc d'Enghien* (Paris, 1888), pp. 282-289, brings forward many facts which leave little doubt that they were finally married, though the fact has been frequently denied.

very useful in many respects, but you are very near; take care and do not neglect any precaution to get warning in time and make a safe retreat in case the Consul should take it into his head to have you seized. Do not think there is any courage in acting in defiance in this respect. It would be a rashness unpardonable in the eyes of the whole world and could only have the most frightful consequences."¹ The words seem truly prophetic. This serious warning was given to the Duc nine months before the seizure, by his own grandfather, who was well versed in European intrigues, and better able than any one else to advise him.

This warning of the old Prince evidently piqued the young man a little, for he wrote back that upon his honor he had not entered France. "One must know me very little to be able to say or seek to make others believe that I have put my foot on republican soil, except with the rank and station to which the chance of birth entitles me. I am too proud basely to bow my head. The First Consul can perhaps succeed in destroying me, but he cannot humiliate me. One may travel incognito among the glaciers of Switzerland as I did last year, not having anything better to do; but as for France, when I travel there, I shall have no need to conceal myself."² This clear statement of a man, one of whose chief characteristics was perfect sincerity and openness, can leave no doubt in any one's mind that the rumor was wholly false. Nor is it likely that between the date of this letter (July 18, 1803) and his seizure he ever so far changed his manner of thinking as to enter France even so far as Strasburg, much less to come in disguise to Paris to talk with assassins, as Bonaparte's overzealous spies and advisers represented. This view is confirmed by a letter which the Duc's private secretary, Jacques, wrote in 1823, in which he affirmed that during the residence of the Duc at Ettenheim the latter had never once entered France, and that the Duc had said to him, "I wish to be able, in case of need, to affirm on my honor that I have not been in France."³

Another letter of importance was the result of Bonaparte's offer to Louis XVIII. of a pension if he would renounce his claims to the throne. Louis XVIII. made this offer known to the members of his family, declaring at the same time in firm language that he would never renounce an inalienable right which he held from birth. The Duc d'Enghien, without waiting to consult his family, wrote immediately on March 22, 1803: "The letter which your

¹ *Mémoires de la Maison de Condé*, II. 365, quoted by Boulay, 50.

² *Ibid.*, 51.

³ *Mémoires sur la Révolution Française: La Catastrophe du Duc d'Enghien*, (Paris, 1824), p. 294.

Majesty has deigned to send me has just arrived. . . . I am a Frenchman, Sire, and a Frenchman faithful to my God, to my king and to my oaths of honor. Many will perhaps envy me one day this three-fold advantage. I beg that you will allow me to join my signature to that of the Duc d'Angoulême, adhering, as he does, with my heart and soul, to the contents of the letter of my king."¹ Louis, proud of the noble letter, sent a copy of it to the old Prince of Condé, who allowed it to appear in the English newspapers. Bonaparte may have read it at that time; at any rate it was called to his attention by one of his advisers in March, 1804, and was one additional injury which he imagined the Duc had done him; for this rebuff from Louis XVIII. had been a bitter pill to the First Consul and he felt doubly angry at any émigré who applauded the king's action.

The quiet calm of Ettenheim with its hunting, love-making, and other innocent amusements was very pleasant, but could not fail to become monotonous and oppressive to a man of Enghien's active, ambitious temperament; and this ambition was quite justifiable and natural. Heir of "le grand Condé," he had heard of his ancestor's glories from the cradle; for ten years, as an exile from France, he had sat by the camp-fire and listened to the tales of the great deeds of war achieved by his countrymen in the past; and now at the age of thirty he burned to do something to show himself worthy of his ancestors and of France. The field of battle was the place which his birth, his surroundings, and his natural inclinations pointed out to him as that in which he was to do his work and make himself famous. All the while he was at Ettenheim he tried to keep in touch with the political world. Living only a few miles from the Rhine frontier he gathered much information about the plans of the First Consul and heard many complaints and rumors from persons in France who were opposed to the Consulate, little imagining that the First Consul would one day choose to regard such harmless letters from discontented people in France as a proof that the Duc was a conspirator and had been trying to excite a mutiny among the French troops in Alsace, for which he ought to be put to death.

By the beginning of the year 1804 the political horizon seemed to foreshadow a general continental war as soon as the weather permitted the armies to take the field. The Duc d'Enghien had received a note from the English government asking him to notify the émigrés in his neighborhood of an increase in their pensions. Now surely was the time to solicit from England an active part in the campaign which was to begin on the German frontier. Accordingly,

¹ Welschinger, p. 226; Boulay, p. 45.

on January 15, he sent through Sir Charles Stuart, the English envoy at the Austrian court, a note asking for a military appointment from the English government. He "begs His British Majesty to employ him, no matter how nor in what position, against his implacable enemies in case a continental war breaks out :—whether in allowing him to serve in the armies of the Powers allied with England ; or to join the first English troops on the continent wherever they may land ; or in deigning to confide to him some auxiliary troops in which he could appoint some old faithful French officers and the deserters who might join him. There will be many of them at this moment in the troubles of the Republic ; of this the Duc d'Enghien has convinced himself in a most positive manner by a two years' residence on the frontiers of France."¹ From this letter it is clear that the Duc had no idea of assisting any conspiracy against the First Consul by raising a rebellion in Alsace, as Bonaparte persisted in saying after he had read the note. The Duc was speaking only of a general European war in which he might have an active part.

The Duc d'Enghien, then, had come to Ettenheim because of his love for the Princess Charlotte ; he knew nothing of the conspiracy of Georges Cadoudal ; and he was also glad to stay at Ettenheim near the frontiers of France, because in case of war or disturbance it was a good place from which to invade France and restore the Bourbons to the throne.²

Meanwhile the conspiracy of Georges Cadoudal, too well known to need describing, had been rapidly developing, and Bonaparte and his spies had already begun to scent trouble in the air. The English newspapers were said to contain hints at some sudden uprising in France and extracts from an old pamphlet written against Cromwell, entitled "*Killing no Murder*."³ The First Consul's spies in the west of France and in Normandy had noted a suspicious agitation among the peasants and a gathering of armed bands of Chouans ; and the spies in Germany reported great activity on the part of the English agents, especially of Drake at Munich. What

¹ Austrian Record Office, quoted in Boulay, p. 288.

² The opinion of Massias, the French envoy to Baden, in which Ettenheim lay, is worth quoting for its good sense and justness and because no one was in a better position to know about what went on in Baden than himself. He wrote to Talleyrand, the moment he heard of the Duc's arrest, "The Duc d'Enghien is a Royalist full of loyalty ; he hates England and is humiliated at having to live on a pension ; he economizes to be able to do without it ; he lives at Ettenheim in great simplicity, giving to the poor in accordance with his means ; he was not made for intrigue, hates all cowardice and abhors assassins." Foreign Office of Baden, quoted in Boulay, p. 321.

³ Nougarié de Fayet, *Recherches Historiques sur le Procès et la Condamnation du Duc d'Enghien* (2 vols., Paris, 1844) I. 32.

did all these suspicious movements and indications signify? was the question Bonaparte asked himself at the beginning of 1804.

Throughout 1803 several persons had been arrested in Paris or near the coasts because they were suspected of having communication with England or could give no good account of themselves. One of these, to save his life (January 24, 1804), revealed the secret that Georges was somewhere in Paris with the purpose of killing the First Consul, that three disembarkations of Royalists had been made in Normandy at a smugglers' rendezvous called Biville, and that a fourth important landing was to be attempted in a short time. Bonaparte now set his spies to work to find the exact hiding-place of Georges and who his accomplices were. He also sent his aide-de-camp, Savary, later created Duc de Rovigo, to Biville to watch for the fourth disembarkation. In a few days an English brig appeared in the offing, which a Chouan assured Savary was the same vessel that had landed Royalists before. But though Savary acted cautiously and tried to lure the brig in with false signals, she still held off and finally stood back for the English coast.¹ Either the Comte d'Artois or his son, whichever was on board, had had a warning that the plot was discovered; or perhaps at the last moment their caution got the better of their courage and they preferred safety in England to danger in France. Savary waited at Biville for a month, hoping that the brig would return; then he returned to Paris and reported himself to Bonaparte on March 19, just in time to play his part in the tragedy of the Duc d'Enghien.

While Savary was thus trying to entrap Bourbons and conspirators on the coast of Normandy, revelations obtained in Paris as to the relations between Pichegru and Moreau led to Moreau's arrest on February 15; and on February 28, Pichegru, who, next to Georges Cadoudal, was the most prominent man in the plot, was

¹ Savary gives a detailed account of his mission to Normandy in his *Mémoires* (Paris, 1829) II. 10-45, and of his share in the execution of the Duc in the following thirty pages, though not quite truthfully. Their veracity was attacked in 1823 and he at once wrote in his defense, but without any more regard to the strict truth than before, a "*Supplementary Chapter on the Catastrophe of the Duc d'Enghien*"; this may be found on pp. 347-489 in his *Mémoires*, Vol. II. Much of what Savary has to say on this affair may also be found, under the title *Extrait des Mémoires de M. le Duc de Rovigo*, in the *Catastrophe du Duc d'Enghien*, pp. 9-56, one of a series of books entitled *Mémoires Historiques sur la Révolution Française* (Baudouin Frères, Paris, 1823). This book also contains, among other material relating to the Duc d'Enghien's death, two considerable pamphlets which were called out by Savary's accusations and by the heated discussion which took place in 1823: Dupin's *Discussion des Actes de la Commission Militaire*, pp. 57-113, and Hulin's *Explications Offertes aux Hommes Impartiaux*, pp. 115-125. It is interesting to see Hulin and Savary laying the blame for certain things upon each other, but as they were both the agents of Bonaparte it makes little difference, so far as his personal liability is concerned, which of his agents executed his orders.

seized in the house of a friend who had given him shelter and then betrayed him.

One of the First Consul's secret agents at this time was a certain Méhée la Touche. An old Septembriseur and ardent Jacobin, Méhée was one of the numerous persons of whom Bonaparte had rid himself by banishment on the ground that he had had something to do with the infernal machine of the 3d Nivôse. Hearing from his wife in Paris that the Grand Judge could perhaps obtain a pardon for him to return to France if he would render some signal service to his country, he determined to see what treachery could accomplish, and sent a note to the British Cabinet, declaring that he had abjured his old errors of the Revolution and was ready to unite himself to the cause of the Bourbons; he said that he and many Jacobin friends in Paris formed a Republican committee which was opposed to the Consulate; that they could be reconciled with the Royalists, who also opposed the Consulate; and that together they could accomplish something against the First Consul. Méhée said that he could bring about this alliance of Jacobins and Royalists, if they would give him money with which to go to Paris; that on his way he would take a look at the situation in Germany and have a talk with Drake, the English envoy at Munich, who would get him a passport into France and give him letters to Royalist friends. The English government swallowed the bait and gave him the money. Drake was a foolish, self-important official without too scrupulous a conception of the behavior expected of diplomatic agents, and with a great taste for the excitement and secrecy of conspiracies. When, therefore, Méhée came to him in October 1803, with a smile on his face and the references of the British government in his hand, and spoke knowingly of a Jacobin committee in Paris desirous of uniting with the Royalists, and of many other fictitious things, Drake at once fell into the trap, delighted at the prospective chance of intriguing in France. He gave Méhée 10,000 francs, a passport into France under an assumed name, and letters of introduction to many English agents and Royalists, including the Comte de Musset and several émigrés who formed a harmless little group of malcontents at Offenburg, a town in Baden about six miles north of Ettenheim, and, like it, but a short distance from the Rhine frontier. Méhée made their acquaintance and then passed on into France to tell Bonaparte his plan to deceive the English agents as to the real plans of the French, while at the same time learning the plans of the English themselves. Bonaparte was pleased with the idea and for the next three months carried on a continual correspondence with Drake through Méhée, Drake of course never suspecting that his communications, of little

real importance to be sure, ever reached any other ears than those of Méhée and his Jacobin-Royalist fellow-intriguers.

When, in January 1804, the rumors of a conspiracy against the First Consul began to be confirmed, Méhée was directed to write and ask Drake what news he had of the landing of Georges and the Royalists; but Drake replied that what Méhée mentioned in his letter was the first and only knowledge he had received of any Royalist landing in Normandy, so that the French government felt convinced that he knew nothing of the Georges conspiracy. As there had been frequent reports that Royalists were stirring actively on the right bank of the Rhine, Méhée went to Offenbourg toward the end of February to see for himself what was going on. He there again met M. de Musset, who gladly renewed his confidences to Bonaparte's spy, telling him that several old officers of the army of Condé in the pay of England had come to Offenbourg lately to organize, and that they were acting in concert with the Duc d'Enghien, to whom they were going to join themselves when they should get instructions from England.¹ Méhée returned to Strasburg to write a report to Réal² of what he had learned at Offenbourg.

Réal received Méhée's report on March 1 and showed it to Bonaparte, who read it carefully and was struck with the mention of the Duc d'Enghien's name; he asked Réal exactly where it was in Baden that the Duc was living and whether he was still there. Réal did not know; he learned from the foreign office (Talleyrand) that it was at Ettenheim, but could not find out whether he was still there. Bonaparte then directed Réal to write to Shée, the prefect of the Lower Rhine at Strasburg, to find if the Duc d'Enghien was still at Ettenheim. "The information which you are to collect must be prompt and sure," said the letter; "in case the Duc is no longer in the town you are to inform me immediately by a special courier, and tell me at the same time the exact moment when he disappeared, what direction he took, and what is his supposed destination."³ Bonaparte was evidently agitated at the news about the Duc d'Enghien and anxious to have exact and immediate information as to his whereabouts; it seems quite probable that the idea of seizing the Duc dates from this moment, and that this is why he was in such haste for exact information; he had just heard that

¹ Nougarede, I. 167.

² Since the dismissal of Fouché some months before and the consequent abolishment of the Ministry of General Police, this part of the administration—the care of the internal safety of the state—had been given over to a Councillor of State, who happened at this time to be Réal; this Councillor of State was subject to the direction of the Grand Judge, or Minister of Justice, M. Regnier.

³ Nougarede, I. 172.

one of the Bourbons had escaped his grasp in Normandy; why, thought he, was not this other Bourbon in Ettenheim just as good to make an example of? Upon the receipt of this letter Shée despatched an under officer, named Lamothe, to Ettenheim to make a report in accordance with Réal's order,—the report which was to result so fatally for the young prince.

The success of Méhée, and the favor of the First Consul of which he boasted, roused a spirit of rivalry in the officers along the Rhine, and induced them to spy upon the doings at Offenburg and make reports to Paris of what they found. Prefect Shée showed himself especially active in discovering everything and denouncing everything. Popp, a police commissioner, and General Leval, commandant of the division at Strasburg, both wrote letters, which must have reached Bonaparte on the second or third of March, denouncing the Baroness de Reich and other émigrés at Offenburg. "One sees there," said Popp, "a number of French émigrés, among whom there must be some persons of distinction. But from the information which I have been able to procure, it does not appear that this assemblage is dangerous; however, the government may judge that it deserves some attention."¹ This language was moderate; that of Leval passed all bounds: "You have undoubtedly been informed," he wrote to Regnier, "of the intrigues which are being hatched at Offenburg by the six or seven hundred émigrés who are living there."² As a result of these and many similar reports Regnier, on March 7, reported to Bonaparte through Talleyrand that there was a committee of French émigrés in the pay of the English government at Offenburg, whose object was to excite trouble in France by all possible methods; that it had as its chief agent a man named Mucey (Muset), who, having bribed the necessary postmasters, was introducing into France "incendiary mandates of rebel bishops, as well as the infamous libels which are manufactured in foreign parts to the detriment of France and its government."³ Regnier ended his report by suggesting that the First Consul get hold of these obnoxious persons. This was an easy matter for Bonaparte; knowing well that the Elector of Baden would not dare to refuse what he demanded, he caused Talleyrand to write a note to Carlsruhe requesting the Elector to seize and extradite to France these fomentors of disorder. This note was despatched from Paris on March 10, but before the Elector could act on it, Bonaparte had

¹ Boulay de la Meurthe, 127.

² *Ibid.*, note 2.

³ Talleyrand, *Memoirs* (trans. by A. Hall), III. 207 *seq.* and Boulay de la Meurthe, p. 308.

already taken matters into his own hands. This was the first touch of his severity ; more important measures were in reserve.

While Bonaparte, angry at the escape of the Comte d'Artois, provoked that Georges, the chief actor in the conspiracy against his life, was still at large in Paris, and annoyed at the apparent military activity on the right bank of the Rhine and at the presence of the Austrian troops in Bavaria, waited in Paris for Lamothe's report, that agent had left Strasburg on March 4, and, having stopped a little while at Kappel to gather information, reached Ettenheim at nightfall ; then returning by way of Offenburg early next morning, he reached Strasburg in time to make out his report the same day. One copy of this report was given to the prefect Shée, who, after adding a report of his own, sent it to Réal, who received it on the 9th of March ; and another copy was, according to military custom, sent by Lamothe to Moncey, his superior officer in the gendarmerie, who received it early on the morning of March 8 and showed it to the First Consul about eleven o'clock. In it he read¹ that the Duc d'Enghien was still at Ettenheim ; that he lived there simply, hunted daily, and seemed to be loved by every one in the neighborhood ; that it was supposed that he intended to remove soon to Freiburg in the Breisgau, Austrian territory ; and that for several weeks he had some interchange of letters with that town and with Offenburg. These details of Lamothe's were true, but the rest of the report, founded upon induction rather than upon facts, contained absurd blunders into which his credulous imagination had led him. After greatly exaggerating the number and importance of the émigrés at Offenburg, he declared that with the Duc were two old officers of the army of Condé, named Grunstein and Smith, who had recently arrived from England. This was absolutely false ; Schmitt, not Smith, was a native of Hesse-Darmstadt and had not come from England ; Grunstein was an aged major who had lived for two years in Baden and intended soon to go to Austria. But the greatest blunder, and that which was most fatal to the young prince, was that Lamothe, hearing at Kappel from some German lips that a man named "Thumery" was at Ettenheim, understood his informant to pronounce the name of the revolutionary General "Dumouriez," who had been a traitor in 1793 and was lately known to be with the Royalists in England.

At the sight of Dumouriez's name, Bonaparte, imagining that Drake, Enghien, Dumouriez, Georges, and the whole body of Royalists were in one great conspiracy against him, lost all control of himself, and, bursting with anger, broke forth, "Am I a dog to be

¹ Report of Lamothe, Nougarede, I. 208-210.

knocked to death in the street? Why was I not warned that they were assembling at Ettenheim? Are my murderers sacred beings? They attack my very person. I'll give them blow for blow."¹ Then as Réal entered, Bonaparte turned upon him and asked him why he had not told him "that Enghien and Dumouriez were plotting against his life within four miles of the frontier? What good were his police?"² To which Réal replied that he had told Bonaparte all he knew and was still waiting for his own copy of the report from Shée and Lamothe, which in fact did not come till the next day, but which would only have made Bonaparte all the angrier; for Shée not only confirmed all that Lamothe had said as true, but added that Enghien had often entered France as far as Strasburg, which was, as shown above, equally false. Then he turned upon Talleyrand in the same manner, demanding how it was that Massias, the *chargé d'affaires* of France at Carlsruhe, had not reported upon such facts to the foreign office. In vain did Talleyrand try to allay his anger by reminding him that the presence of the prince in the electorate had long been known to him,³ that he had even charged Talleyrand to inform the Elector that the prince might reside at Ettenheim.⁴ Then instead of trying to protect his inferior, Talleyrand, believing it easier to accuse him, declared that Massias had neglected to mention the intrigues which were being carried on at Offenbourg, perhaps either because he did not think it of sufficient importance, or because he had married a relative of the Baroness de Reich, one of the chief disturbing spirits of Offenbourg, and feared to compromise her.⁵

The events of the following day (March 9) only tended to confirm Bonaparte in his opinion that there was one great concerted plot against him, with Dumouriez and Enghien at the head of it, on the Rhine frontier. Dumouriez, in all the various places to which his ambition had led him, had always shown that he had an enterprising spirit, a mind fertile in devising unscrupulous schemes and an adventurous temperament to try anything which might better his

¹ Desmarest, *Témoignages Hist.*, p. 128, quoted by Boulay de la Meurthe, p. 140, note 1.

² Ségur, *Mémoires*, II. 227, seq.; L. Constant, *Le Duc d'Enghien*, pp. 8-10.

³ Massias wrote to Talleyrand Sept. 15, 1803, "J'apprends que le Duc d'Enghien est à Ettenheim chez le Prince de Rohan." But it is not certain that the Minister of Foreign Affairs told the First Consul of the fact at that time.

⁴ Talleyrand states twice in his *Mémoires* (III. 211, 213) that he was instructed by the First Consul to inform the Elector that he had no objection to the Duc's living at Ettenheim.

⁵ This was a lie, and Bonaparte evidently suspected as much, for shortly afterward in a letter to Réal (*Corr. de Nap.*, IX. 7631), he says, "I beg you to see whether Massias is married or not, and what are the grounds of suspicion against him."

fortune. Bonaparte knew all this and perceived that he was just the man to engage in a plan to overturn the consular government. Precisely at this moment a despatch was received from the French ambassador at Naples enclosing a letter addressed to Admiral Nelson, in which Dumouriez expressed himself as follows: "It is not enough for England to be prepared to receive the enemy, she must go to seek him; if they take my advice they will make an important expedition which I have advised, the success of which cannot be doubted."¹ This was the plan, Bonaparte felt sure, which Dumouriez had come to carry out with the aid of the Duc d'Enghien, who must likewise therefore be a dangerous person.

This day was not to end without fresh appearances of the Duc's guilt being added to the preceding false evidence, already probably sufficient to have led to his seizure. In the evening Georges Cadoudal, who up to this time had succeeded in evading the most diligent efforts of the police, was recognized in a cabriolet in one of the streets of Paris, and arrested after a desperate resistance. On being questioned, he boldly declared that he had come to Paris with the express intention of making an open attack on the First Consul, and had only been delaying to carry out his purpose until the arrival of a prince at Paris, who had not yet come. The preponderating part taken by the Bourbons in the plot had long been suspected by Bonaparte; after such a formal declaration it could no longer be doubted. The only question was, *which* prince did Georges refer to? If Bonaparte had looked at the question dispassionately, and used his reason, he could have had no doubt, from the declarations which prisoners had already made, that this prince was the Comte d'Artois, who had promised to place himself at Georges' side at the critical moment; but who, as Georges said, had not yet been able to arrive at Paris, having turned back when he had come in sight of Normandy. But Bonaparte did not choose to look at it in this way; since reading Lamothe's report he had fixed it in his mind that Enghien was the guilty Bourbon prince. Why was it not likely that the Comte d'Artois, who fled so quickly in time of danger, had found in his rash young relative on the Rhine, who dared to do anything, the necessary auxiliary to Georges' plans, and that the Duc d'Enghien was to come to Paris instead of the Comte d'Artois? This idea was confirmed next morning by more evidence, fallaciously interpreted, like all the preceding evidence.

At the same time that Georges was seized, two of his servants were also arrested; in their examination the next morning, one of them, Lérident, avowed that every little while there came to his

¹ Boulay de la Meurthe, 141.

master's house at Chaillot a mysterious man whose name he did not know ; but he thought the man must be a very important person, for he was well-dressed, and, whenever he came, everyone stood up, even the Polignacs and Rivière, and did not take their seats again till he was gone.¹ Having heard frequently that they were expecting a prince, Lérident said he thought this strange visitor might be he. The First Consul seized eagerly upon this information and compared it with Shée's statement, which he had received the day before, and thought it true, though in reality it was not, that Enghien had frequently entered France as far as Strasbourg to go to the theatre, if not for other purposes, and that he was often absent five or six days from Ettenheim in hunting expeditions ; he immediately concluded that if the Duc risked his life to go to Strasbourg merely for the theatre, he would surely dare to come to Paris for a matter of such importance as a conference with his fellow-conspirators ; that when he had been said to be absent from Ettenheim six days on a hunt, he had in reality been in Paris—two days to come, two days to stay and plot, and two days to return again to Ettenheim. Suppositions excited by fear and suspicion are of rapid growth. So strong was the idea that it was the Duc d'Enghien who had been in Paris, and that he even then might be in the city, that the principal houses in the Faubourg St. Germain were searched to see whether he was not actually in hiding at that moment, or whether preparations had not been made to receive him.² What has already been said of the Duc d'Enghien's manner of living and way of thinking need not be repeated to show the absurdity of the idea that he might be skulking secretly about in Paris. But, on the other hand, it is possible to see how the First Consul, drawing his inferences from false evidence, and looking at things, not with the fair eye of a judge, but with the eye of a man full of anger at the discovery of a conspiracy against his life, decided to seize and court-martial immediately those whom he believed to be leagued against him. We may at least do Bonaparte the justice to suppose that on March 10, when he ordered the arrest of the Duc d'Enghien, he honestly believed that he was arresting a guilty conspirator and averting a terrible catastrophe from France and from himself.

Bonaparte's experience in war and politics had taught him how necessary a quick decision and prompt execution are to success. Already the note had been despatched to the Elector of Baden ask-

¹ Nougarede, I. 237. This man was probably Pichegru, for Lérident, in repeating the names of all the friends of Georges, had not mentioned that of Pichegru ; Pichegru was, however, somewhat older than the man described.

² Méneval, *Memoirs of Napoleon I.*, I. 249 (trans. by Sherard, 3 vols., London, 1894).

ing for the arrest of the Baroness de Reich and others;¹ he might also now have asked the Elector to extradite Dumouriez and Enghien, and the Elector would have been glad to comply; but Bonaparte feared that before the Elector could arrest them, his birds would have flown. Therefore he had made up his mind that the only course to pursue was to send a small body of troops into the electorate and seize the conspirators himself.

Fouché had not been inactive since his dismissal; he often used to come and tell the First Consul news which he had secured, thanks to the influence which he had retained over the police agents and the confidences which he extracted from them, thus beating the Grand Judge at his own business. This sharper, like Talleyrand, advised the First Consul to make an example of the Duc d'Enghien which should forever strike terror into the hearts of all Bourbons and Royalists. Talleyrand further suggested that such an extreme measure would forever dispel the feeling, supposed to be entertained by some, that Napoleon would betray the Revolution and play the part in France which Monk had played in England. As for the violation of neutral territory, Talleyrand undertook to make it right with the Elector. That both Fouché and Talleyrand urged the First Consul to take this step there can be no doubt;² but it is almost equally certain that it was not they who decided him to take the step, for upon that he had already made up his mind for himself, either on the morning of the 10th or more probably previously;³ their arguments merely added weight to his decision. After these separate talks a council, composed of the three Consuls, Talleyrand, and the Grand Judge, was held on March 10 in the evening. The Grand Judge opened the meeting with a review of the numerous proofs of the Duc's guilt. Talleyrand and Fouché repeated their reasons for favoring severity. Consul Lebrun spoke of the outcry which such an act would call forth in France and in Europe; but before the close of the council he had been induced by the others to favor the seizure. Cambacérès alone pronounced himself decidedly op-

¹ Talleyrand's note of March 10; *supra*, p. 627.

² Both these wily men believed that their interests were not different from those of Bonaparte. Talleyrand saw that the destruction of the First Consul would in all probability overturn the fortunes of the Minister of Foreign Affairs, for he was suspected by the Jacobins on account of his birth and by the Royalists on account of his acts; but that to disarm the conspirators by a sudden blow would be to secure to both First Consul and Minister a power which was to increase with the Empire which was already talked of. Fouché also hoped to be reappointed Minister of Police in the new imperial government. Pasquier, I. 208-214; Méneval, I. 269-271; Welschinger, 410-448; Chateaubriand, *Mémoires d'Outre Tombe*, II. 417-425 (Paris, 1880); Bourrienne, *Mémoires of Napoleon Bonaparte*, II. 254-284 (trans. by Phipps, New York, 1889).

³ On March 1, when his attention was first seriously directed to Ettenheim by Méhée's report; *supra*, p. 626.

posed to the step; he said he feared lest public opinion, which was already aroused in regard to Moreau, might suddenly turn in favor of the heir of the great Condé, whose youthful inexperience had been taken advantage of by Dumouriez's practised knavery; that it was only too easy to revive the remembrance of the Reign of Terror in men's minds; and finally that if the Duc, who they said had come to Strasburg and Paris, should dare to enter France again, then they could seize him and everyone would recognize that he was justly put to death. Bonaparte listened to Cambacérés without impatience,¹ and then closed the council by announcing that his mind was made up to have the Duc seized.

Bonaparte then sent for his secretary, Méneval, Berthier, Minister of War, and Generals Caulaincourt and Ordener,² and took down his maps of the Rhine frontier. When they had come, he dictated to Méneval precise instructions for the conduct of the capturing party, and at the same time pointed out on the map with his finger to Caulaincourt and Ordener the route which they were to take. These instructions³ were so carefully prearranged that they were followed out four days later to the very letter. Ordener was to go to Ettenheim in the night and seize the Duc, Dumouriez, and all other suspected persons found there, and bring them prisoners to Strasburg. On the same night another body of troops under the command of Caulaincourt was to march to Offenbourg and seize all émigrés and other suspects who had been denounced by Méhée. Caulaincourt was further directed to place patrols on the road from Offenbourg to Ettenheim to protect Ordener, and as soon as he heard that Ordener had been successful, to send a note to the Elector telling him what had been done. Talleyrand was the man who prepared this letter,⁴ which was more of a reproach than an apology, to a man who would not dare to resent it. Bonaparte had now given the order for the seizure; the execution of it was left to his

¹ Cambacérés, *Mém. Inédites* (quoted in Boulay, p. 154).

² Méneval, I. 250-255; Doris, *Memoirs of Napoleon*, 113 (London, 1896).

³ *Corr. de Nap.*, 7608.

⁴ "I had just written you a note asking for the arrest of the committee of émigrés at Offenbourg, when the First Consul, by the successive arrests of the brigands whom the English government has vomited upon the shores of France . . . learned the whole part which the English agents at Offenbourg have had in the horrible plots hatched up against his own person and the safety of France. He has heard in the same way that the Duc d'Enghien and General Dumouriez were at Ettenheim . . . and could only see with the greatest grief that His Electoral Highness . . . had given an asylum to his most cruel enemies and allowed them to hatch in peace such unheard-of plots. In these extraordinary circumstances the First Consul has believed it his duty to order two small detachments to go to Offenbourg and Ettenheim to seize there the instigators of a crime which, by its nature, puts outside the law of nations all persons who have clearly taken part in it . . . " Nougarede, I. 265; Talleyrand, *Memoirs*, III. 212.

subordinates. Meanwhile he went to Malmaison to spend a week until the whole affair of the Duc d'Enghien had been settled.

After receiving his instructions, General Ordener left Paris on March 11, and arrived at Strasburg late the following night. The next day, Tuesday, the 13th, he talked over the necessary preparations with Prefect Shée and Leval, the commander of the troops at Strasburg, and decided to send a couple of spies, named Stohl and Pfersdorf, to Ettenheim the next day to see that all was favorable for making the seizure. Caulaincourt, who had to wait for Talleyrand's note to the Elector and for some other instructions relative to the seizure of the Baroness de Reich and her papers, did not reach Strasburg till the afternoon of Wednesday. The two spies having returned about the same time, and reported that the Duc was still there, though they had not actually seen him, and that all was quiet, it was decided by Caulaincourt, Ordener, and Leval that not the slightest change need be made in Bonaparte's orders. They accordingly despatched the courier Thibaud to announce to Bonaparte that his orders were to be put into execution that very night (Wednesday, March 14). Ordener, who had much farther to go, set off immediately for Schlestadt, where he got some dragoons and proceeded straight to Rhinau. Here boats had been collected to take across the three hundred dragoons and the detachment of gendarmes who comprised the party. With him went Fririon the commandant of the department, Charlot, chief of the gendarmes, and the spy Pfersdorf. Ordener effected the crossing some time after midnight and proceeded straight to Ettenheim by way of Kappel and Altdorf.¹

Of the details of the arrest and of what happened at Ettenheim a day or two previously, we have an excellent account entitled, "Les derniers jours de la vie de Monseigneur le duc d'Enghien," written by M. de Bonnay as the events were related to him a year later by Canone, a faithful servant of the Duc.²

"On March 12," says Canone in his delightfully simple, honest narrative, "the Duc was secretly warned that Bonaparte wished to have him seized; the news came from a trustworthy person who begged the Prince to quit Ettenheim immediately.³ But the Duc, little accustomed to believe in danger and still less to flee

¹ A detailed map accompanies the *Examen Impartial des Calomnies répandues sur M. de Caulaincourt à l'Occasion de la Catastrophe de Mgr. le Duc d'Enghien* which is found in *Catastrophe du Duc d'Enghien*, 127-233.

² This is reprinted by Boulay, pp. 170-188. This account may be supplemented by Charlot's detailed report in *Catastrophe du Duc d'Enghien*, pp. 229-233.

³ As Ordener did not arrive at Strasburg till late on the night of the 12th, no news of the expedition could have reached the Duc on that day; this was probably one of the warnings founded on likelihood only, of which the Duc had already received several.

from it, disregarded this advice, which he treated as fiction." On the 13th the Duc went hunting, but having heard the rumors of the arrest of the Baroness de Reich, "told Canone to keep watch during the night in the streets of Ettenheim. This unfortunate prince was persuaded that if Bonaparte dared to have him seized, it would only be by means of a small body of disguised brigands, and that, provided he were not surprised in his sleep, it would be easy to defend himself against them." Early Wednesday morning (March 14), Canone saw through the windows of the first story two men who were looking attentively at the house,—Stohl and Pfersdorf. "Canone went to tell his master of his discovery and offered to follow these two men and give a good account of them to him. But the Duc told Canone that he was nervous and that he was frightening himself with chimeras; he bade him calm himself, but to observe the two men and see what became of them. Canone ran off and soon returned to tell the prince that the spy Pfersdorf was keeping watch at the door of the inn, without doubt to see when he went out and get a description of him, but that as the Duc had not come out soon enough, the man, tired of waiting, had given up hope and gone away. Canone wished to follow him on horseback, but the Duc, fearing the excess and warmth of his zeal, was opposed to it, and sent in his stead Lieutenant Schmitt to try to discover the doings of the spy." Then the Duc and Canone went out into the woods to hunt, "when a peasant, coming through the woods, met them and gave the prince a letter. It was written by a resident on the left bank of the Rhine, personally known to the Duc d' Enghien¹; it said in substance that troops were moving in the neighborhood and that all the boats had been brought to the left bank of the river as if to convey the troops across; it begged the prince to betake himself at the close of day to a little island opposite Ettenheim; the writer of the letter assured him that he would be there and would give him further details. At this news the Duc called off the dogs and returned to

¹ M. Roesch, notary public at Rhinau; there can be no doubt of this touching incident. General Fririon relates in his *Memoirs* (quoted in Welschinger, p. 273) that he was "dining with a certain M. Stumpf, . . . when I received an order to cross the Rhine during the night with a detachment of cavalry and go to arrest the Duc d' Enghien at Ettenheim. I was violently agitated on reading this order, which involved a violation of territory and which, for this very reason, appeared to me profoundly unjust. . . . Time pressed; I did not know the Duc d' Enghien; I had never even seen him; but even though I endangered myself, I did not hesitate to send him a warning and urge him to take his flight, feeling sure that in hindering the government from making an arbitrary arrest, I should avoid embarrassing it with a person who was not dangerous to its security." He then left the table, beckoned M. Stumpf into a private room, and, telling him the contents of the order, begged him to warn the prince. Stumpf accordingly wrote to Roesch at Rhinau, who in turn sent the note to the Duc in the forest.

Ettenheim. He went at once to the room of his secretary, M. Jacques, . . . and read him the letter he had just received. As the hour drew near, M. Jacques was of the opinion that this was no time for hesitation and that His Highness ought to go to the place indicated. After a moment of silence the Duc replied, 'All things considered, I shall not go.' M. Jacques then proposed to send Canone and the Duc consented. But it was fated that this unfortunate prince should reject all the pieces of advice which might have saved him; at the moment when Canone was about to start, he made him stay. It was afterwards known that the giver of this advice went according to his promise and not without danger to the rendezvous, waited there a long time, and finally returned, having despaired of being able to let the prince know all that he had discovered since the time of sending the letter . . . "

But from the preparations which the Duc made that evening it is clear that he himself gave much thought to the contents of the letter and felt that it would be better to take some precautions. "He had two beds put in the room next his own, one for Grunstein and the other for Schmitt. When he had undressed he asked for his arms, had them put on a table with some ammunition, and then ordered Canone to go and make sure that all the doors of the house were well fastened; finally he told him to have his gun by his side when he lay down." They all went to bed about eleven o'clock—the moment when the French troops were preparing to cross the river at Rhinau. About two o'clock in the morning Lieut. Schmitt thought he heard the stamping of horses. He roused Baron Grunstein; both went to the window and waited and listened. The night was so dark they could not see anything; the noise stopped. After a short conversation in a low voice they cast themselves, tired out, upon their beds, but ready to get up at the least alarm.

A little after five o'clock—the fifteenth of March was just dawn-ing in the east—the sound of horses was heard again, this time more clearly and distinctly. Grunstein and Schmitt reopened the window and saw Charlot's gendarmes scaling the walls. The Duc, roused by the same noise, cried to Canone, "Quick with your gun! they are at the door!" Seizing their guns they both went to the windows, opened them and looked out ready to fire. "Who is in command?" shouted the Duc. "We do not have to account to you," replied a voice. The Duc took aim at the man who had spoken, when Grunstein, stepping in from the next room, laid his hand on his arm and asked, "Are you compromised?" To the Duc's reply that he was not, Grunstein said there was no use resisting, especially as the court was full of soldiers, and it would only make matters worse to shoot their officer.¹

¹ Narratives of Canone, Schmitt and Charlot. It seems, however, that Grunstein

"Then Canone, seeing that all was lost, ran to a servant's room where he still had some hope of saving the Duc; two footmen had already left successfully out of the windows; if the Duc had tried it he would never have been found nor harmed; the two footmen never were. Canone returned to beg him to do this, since resistance was no longer possible. But the Duc could never make up his mind to flee." A moment later the gendarmes entered the room, and Charlot ordered his men to take all the prisoners, including Jacques, who for some days had been sick in bed, outside the town and wait for him near a mill called the Tuileries on the road to Kappel. Here again Canone's narrative shows his devotion to his master and his own harmless self-conceit: "Here by the mill was a small stream which people crossed on a narrow plank. Canone made several signs to the Duc to show him the passage. From the other side of the stream it was only a five minutes' run to reach the vineyard, and if the Duc, who ran better than anybody, could have reached it, he would have been lost from sight; some balls would, perhaps, have whistled about his ears; but he would have escaped. This inspiration of Canone, who, as we have seen, never lost his head for an instant, was the fifth or sixth means of safety which he had indicated to his master; the others had been rejected; this last was not understood."

Meanwhile Charlot had gone to the house where Pfersdorf said Dumouriez lived, and found there, not the ex-general as he had expected, but only the aged Marquis de Thumery. "I gathered information," said Charlot in his report, "to know whether Dumouriez had appeared at Ettenheim; I was assured that he had not; I presume that this was only a supposition, resulting from confounding his name with that of General Thumery. . . The Duc d'Enghien has assured me that Dumouriez has not come to Ettenheim; that, however, it was possible that he had been charged to bring him instructions from England, but that he had not received them, because it was beneath his rank to have anything to do with such men." There was no longer the slightest doubt of the blunder about

was mistaken in thinking resistance was useless. Ordener and the main body of troops had not yet arrived, either being delayed in crossing the Rhine or having waited outside of Ettenheim. Ségur, who a few weeks later heard the account of the seizure from Charlot's own mouth at Strasburg, says (*Mémoires*, Vol. II., p. 257), "The fatal shot would have been fired, thus beginning a conflict in which all the chances, according to the commandant himself, would have been *against* the assailants, when the prince's evil genius caused Grunstein to put his hand," etc. Boulay de la Meurthe (p. 179) quotes a police note to the following effect: "The Duc had sixty shots ready to fire and seven persons with him. The house was as yet surrounded by only thirty gendarmes and dragons. If resistance had been made and the villagers, who were devoted to the Duc, had had time to arrive, the result of the expedition would have been uncertain, and, whatever it had been, French blood would have been spilled."

Dumouriez.¹ Then, having possessed himself of all the Duc's papers, Charlot returned to the mill, put the prince and the other prisoners in a peasant's cart, and conducted the sad group back to the Rhine by way of Graffhausen and Kappel, and thence finally to Strasburg, which they reached about four in the afternoon.

This same Thursday afternoon, after Caulaincourt and Ordener had returned to Strasburg, they despatched the courier Amadour to Bonaparte to announce the successful arrest of the Duc. The two days, which elapsed before further orders from the First Consul reached Strasburg, were for the unhappy prisoner full of gloom and uncertainty as to the future.² He was also much troubled in his heart for the Princess Charlotte, lest the news might prostrate her, or lest she might attempt to follow him and share his lot. Friday morning he wrote to her: "My whole fear is that this letter will not reach you at Ettenheim and that you have already started to come here. . . . They believe that Dumouriez and I have had conferences together, and apparently he is implicated in the conspiracy against the life of the First Consul. But my ignorance of that whole matter makes me hope that I shall obtain my liberty soon. . . . The attachment of my servants draws tears to my eyes constantly; they could have escaped; they were not forced to follow me; they preferred to; I have Féron, Joseph and Poulain; good Mohiloff³ has not left me for a single step. . . . Adieu, princess; you have known for a long time my tender and sincere attachment for you; free or in prison it will always be the same. . . ."⁴ This touching letter, full of tenderness and confidence, never reached its destination.

On Friday, March 16, the Duc wrote in his journal: "At half past four, they come to examine my papers, which Col. Charlot, accompanied by a commissary of safety [Popp], opens in my presence. They read them superficially. They do them up in separate bundles and leave me to understand that they are to be sent to Paris. I must then languish weeks, perhaps months! My grief increases, the more I reflect on my cruel position. I go to bed at eleven o'clock; I am worn out and cannot sleep."

The following day was less sad. In the afternoon Charlot came to him to get him to sign the procès-verbal of the opening of his papers. "I ask," wrote the prince in his journal, "and obtain per-

¹ This report reached Bonaparte March 19, so that he too knew two days before the execution of the Duc that he had been mistaken in thinking Dumouriez was at Ettenheim.

² See the *Private Journal of the Duc* from March 15 to March 18, which was taken from his pocket just before he was thrown into his grave. *Catastrophe du Duc d'Enghien*, pp. 88-91.

³ The Duc's dog.

⁴ Enghien to Princess Charlotte, quoted in Nougarede, I. 285-288.

mission to add an explanatory note to prove that I have never had any other intentions than to serve in war and make war."¹ The papers and procès-verbal were then despatched by Ordener to Bonaparte² and reached him Monday morning. But it is a significant fact, as will be pointed out below, that Bonaparte never sent these papers and the procès-verbal with this explicit denial by the Duc of his guilt, to the court-martial which was to try him and which ought to have had all the evidence before it; instead he sent them to Réal and told him to keep them secret.

Saturday evening the prince had been told that according to orders received from Paris he was to have more liberty in his captivity; he was shown a garden where he could walk and all the prisoners were to be allowed to attend mass together on the morrow, which was Passion Sunday. Seeing in this amelioration of the rigors of his captivity a possibility of early release, he went to bed happier than on the previous evenings.³ But he was cruelly disappointed. In the middle of the night he was suddenly awakened and given scarcely time to dress and no time at all to eat anything before he was hustled into a guarded carriage. His servants begged to be allowed to accompany him, but this was refused; the devoted Mohiloff jumped into the carriage however, and when the prince asked that this single friend might go with him, he was not refused. Long before day dawned over Strasburg the Duc d'Enghien was out on the dark highroad to Paris in the bitter chill of a March night, being hurried rapidly to his trial and death. He went under the false name of Plessis; it was Bonaparte's will that everything in connection with the Duc should be done secretly and in the night.

All this was in accordance with orders which had just arrived from the First Consul. It will be remembered that Caulaincourt had despatched the courier, Thibaud, to Bonaparte on the afternoon of March 15, a few hours before the seizure was made. Upon his arrival at Malmaison late the following night Bonaparte wrote to Réal: "I have received a courier from Strasburg. It is during the night of the 23-24 Ventôse (*i. e.*, March 14-15) that the expedition will take place. . . . Write immediately to General Caulaincourt that I have received his letter; that if they have

¹ "Que je n'ai jamais eu d'autres intentions que de servir et faire la guerre,"—*Catastrophe du Duc d'Enghien*, p. 90.

² The note which Ordener sent along with these papers is given in *Catastrophe du Duc d'Enghien*, p. 233. Ordener made an oversight in dating it 24 Ventôse (March 15) instead of 26 Ventôse (March 17); for the statement in the Duc's journal is explicit that his papers were opened on the 16th and sent with the procès-verbal by a special courier to Paris on the afternoon of March 17 (Saturday).

³ "Je soupe et me couche plus content." *Journal of the Duc*.

captured either the Duc d'Enghien or Dumouriez, he is to hurry them into two separate carriages under a good and sure guard and send them to Paris. . . . Ask the commandant at Vincennes for information about the individuals in that fortress and where he could put the prisoners."¹

The Duc d'Enghien had travelled steadily from Strasburg toward Paris without any event of importance, and reached the barrier outside the city about four o'clock Tuesday afternoon (March 20), having been about sixty-three hours on the road. When near Paris a courier had been despatched to Bonaparte at Malmaison to notify him that the Duc would reach the barrier at five o'clock in the afternoon at the latest. Bonaparte instantly sent a messenger to the barrier with orders that the carriage was to go around the walls, and that the Duc should be lodged in the castle of Vincennes.² It was, therefore, between six and seven o'clock that a weary prisoner, pale with fatigue, hunger and cold, known under the name of Plessis, was driven in at the drawbridge of the château of Vincennes. It was the third time that a Condé had entered its sombre walls as a prisoner. In 1627 Henri de Condé had been sent there by Richelieu; in 1650 "le grand Condé" by Mazarin. The first two had left its walls free and happy men; a different fate was awaiting this last scion of the great family.

Harel, who had been appointed by Bonaparte commandant of the castle of Vincennes in 1801 as a reward for his denunciation of the plot of Aréna and Céracchi, had been notified late that very afternoon by a letter from Réal that a "prisoner, whose name must not be known, . . . will probably arrive at the castle of Vincennes to-night. . . . It is the intention of the government that everything shall be kept very secret about him and that no questions shall be asked as to who he is or why he is detained."³ Harel received his mysterious prisoner kindly and sent immediately to a neighboring inn to get a supper for him, as the Duc had had nothing to eat since early morning. The meal was small, but the Duc insisted on sharing what there was of it with his devoted travelling companion, the faithful Mohiloff. After supper the Duc had some conversation with Harel and then went to bed early and dropped into a sound sleep after his two fatiguing days and nights on the journey.

SIDNEY B. FAY.

¹ Bonaparte to Réal, March 15; *Corr. de Nap.*, 7620.

² In view of all the contemporary evidence which says that the Duc's carriage went straight from the barrier along the outskirts of Paris to Vincennes, we do not agree with Welschinger's statement (p. 297 *seq.*) that the Duc was taken to Talleyrand's house, nor with the elaborate indictment against Talleyrand which he builds up on the theory that Talleyrand saw the Duc's carriage approaching his house and left it as fast as he could.

³ Nougarede, I. 305.

THE DELAWARE BILL OF RIGHTS OF 1776

ALTHOUGH the Delaware constitution of 1776 expressly mentions a bill of rights, declaring that "no article of the declaration of rights and fundamental rules of this State, agreed to by this convention . . . ought ever to be violated on any pretence whatever,"¹ for some inexplicable reason this bill of rights is not included by Poore in his *Charters and Constitutions*.² As Delaware was one of the first states, after the outbreak of the Revolution, to adopt a constitution and bill of rights, this document is not merely of interest, but of positive constitutional importance, and its omission by Poore is the more to be regretted because, his work having become the accepted authority for all of our former constitutions, the student of to-day is but too likely to accept the omission on his authority without further question. It is, therefore, desirable to call attention to this bill of rights, which has been too long neglected.

It can be found in several of the newspapers and periodicals of the time,³ in many of the earlier collections of state constitutions,⁴ and, most accessibly, in Force's *American Archives*.⁵ It consists of twenty-three articles, which include most of the rights formulated by Virginia and Pennsylvania, together with many of the provisions of the Maryland declaration. On reading these articles one is impressed with their likeness to the corresponding articles of the Pennsylvania and Maryland bills of rights, and the similarity is so striking as to merit a more careful consideration. In the following comparison the Delaware bill of rights is given in full, with those articles of the Maryland and Pennsylvania declarations which most closely correspond.⁶

¹ Article 30.

² Professor Jellinek, *Die Erklärung der Menschen- und Bürgerrechte* (Leipzig, 1895), p. 13, notices this omission and at the same time calls attention to the fact that a French translation of the American constitutions, which appeared in 1778, included such a bill of rights for Delaware. Professor Schouler, *Constitutional Studies*, p. 40, n. 2, also notes the omission by Poore.

³ *Pennsylvania Gazette*, October 2, 1776; *Maryland Gazette*, October 3, 1776; *The Remembrancer*; or, *Impartial Repository of Public Events, For the year 1776*, Part III. (London, 1777).

⁴ There has come within the writer's notice such a collection published in 1791 in Philadelphia by Carey, Stewart and Co., and another published as late as 1797 in Boston by Manning and Loring, in both of which it is contained.

⁵ Fifth Series, Vol. II., pp. 286, 287.

⁶ The text in each case is taken from Force's *American Archives*, Fifth Series: Delaware from Vol. II., pp. 285, 287; Pennsylvania from Vol. II., pp. 22, 23; Mary-

In Convention of the Delaware State, Wednesday, September 11, 1776, A. M.

A Declaration of Rights and Fundamental Rules of the Delaware State, formerly styled the Government of the Counties of New-Castle, Kent and Sussex, upon Delaware.

1. That all government of right originates from the people, is founded in compact only, and instituted solely for the good of the whole.

2. That all men have a natural and unalienable right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own consciences and understandings, and that no man ought, or of right can be compelled to attend any religious worship or maintain any ministry contrary to or against his own free will and consent, and that no authority can or ought to be vested in, or assumed by any power whatever, that shall in any case interfere with, or in any manner control, the right of conscience in the free exercise of religious worship.

The Pennsylvania Declaration of Rights adopted by the Convention August 16, 1776.

The Maryland Declaration of Rights adopted by the Convention November 3, 1776.

Maryland.

1. That all government of right originates from the people, is founded in compact only, and instituted solely for the good of the whole.

Pennsylvania.

2. That all men have a natural and unalienable right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own consciences and understanding; and that no man ought, or of right can, be compelled to attend any religious worship, or erect or support any place of worship, or maintain any ministry, contrary to, or against his own free will and consent; nor can any man who acknowledges the being of a *God*, be justly deprived or abridged of any civil right as a citizen, on account of his religious sentiments, or peculiar mode of religious worship; and that no authority can or ought to be vested in, or assumed by, any power whatever that shall in any case interfere with, or in any manner control, the right of conscience in the free exercise of religious worship and privileges.

land from Vol. III., pp. 136-139, 143-147. In the Maryland Convention the bill of rights was reported from the committee of the whole house on October 31, and the wording in several instances was modified before its final adoption on November 3. As the first draft is more nearly like the Delaware declaration, both forms have been given in this comparison. The wording in the parentheses is that of the draft reported by the committee of the whole; the changes that were made before its final adoption are italicised.

3. That all persons professing the Christian religion ought forever to enjoy equal rights and privileges in this State, unless under colour of religion any man disturb the peace, the happiness, or safety of society.

4. That the people of this State have the sole, exclusive, and inherent right of governing and regulating the internal police of the same.

5. That persons entrusted with the Legislative and Executive powers are the trustees and servants of the publick, and as such accountable for their conduct; wherefore, whenever the ends of Government are perverted and publick liberty manifestly endangered by the Legislative singly, or a treacherous combination of both, the people may, and of right ought to, establish a new or reform the old Government.

6. That the right in the people to participate in the Legislature is the foundation of liberty and of all free government, and for this end all elections ought to be free and frequent; and every freeman having

Maryland.

(34) 33 . . . no person ought by any law to be molested in his person or estate on account of his religious persuasion or profession, or for his religious practice, unless under colour of religion any man shall disturb the good order, peace, or safety of the State, or shall infringe the laws of morality, or injure others in their natural, civil, or religious rights; etc.

Pennsylvania.

3d. That the people of this State have the sole, exclusive and inherent right of governing and regulating the internal police of the same.

Maryland.

4. That all persons (entrusted) *invested* with the Legislative or Executive powers of Government, are the trustees (and servants) of the publick, and as such accountable for their conduct; wherefore, whenever the ends of Government are perverted, and publick liberty manifestly endangered, and all other means of redress are ineffectual, the people may, and of right ought to reform the old, or establish a new Government; the doctrine of non-resistance against arbitrary power and oppression, is absurd, slavish, and destructive of the good and happiness of mankind.

Maryland.

5. That the right in the people to participate in the Legislature is the best security of liberty, and the foundation of all free Government; for this purpose elections ought to be free and frequent, and every

sufficient evidence of a permanent common interest with, and attachment to, the community, hath a right of suffrage.

7. That no power of suspending laws or the execution of laws ought to be exercised, unless by the Legislature.

8. That for redress of grievances, and for amending and strengthening of the laws, the Legislature ought to be frequently convened.

9. That every man hath a right to petition the Legislature for the redress of grievances in a peaceable and orderly manner.

10. That every member of society hath a right to be protected in the enjoyment of life, liberty, and property, and therefore is bound to contribute his proportion towards the expense of that protection, and yield his personal service when necessary, or an equivalent thereto; but no part of a man's property can be justly taken from him, or applied to publick uses without his own consent or that of his legal representatives: nor can any man that is conscientiously scrupulous of bearing arms in any case be justly compelled thereto if he will pay such equivalent.

man having property in, a common interest with, and an attachment to, the community, ought to have a right of suffrage.

Maryland.

7. That no power of suspending laws or the execution of laws, unless *by or* derived from the Legislature, ought to be exercised or allowed.

Maryland.

10. That for the redress of grievances, and for amending, strengthening and preserving the laws, the Legislature ought to be frequently convened.

Maryland.

11. That every man hath a right to petition the Legislature for the redress of grievances, in a peaceable and orderly manner.

Pennsylvania.

8th. That every member of society hath a right to be protected in the enjoyment of life, liberty, and property, and therefore is bound to contribute his proportion towards the expense of that protection, and yield his personal service, when necessary, or an equivalent thereto; but no part of a man's property can be justly taken from him, or applied to publick uses, without his own consent, or that of his legal representatives: nor can any man who is conscientiously scrupulous of bearing arms, be justly compelled thereto, if he will pay such equivalent: nor are the people bound by any laws but such as they have in like manner assented to for their common good.

11. That retrospective laws punishing offences committed before the existence of such laws are oppressive and unjust, and ought not to be made.

12. That every freeman for every injury done him in his goods, lands, or person, by any other person, ought to have remedy by the course of the law of the land, and ought to have justice and right for the injury done to him freely without sale, fully without any denial, and speedily without delay, according to the law of the land.

13. That trial by jury of the facts where they arise, is one of the greatest securities of the lives, liberties, and estates of the people.

14. That in all prosecutions for criminal offences, every man hath a right to be informed of the accusation against him, to be allowed counsel, to be confronted with the accusers or witnesses, to examine evidence on oath in his favour, and to a speedy trial by an impartial jury, without whose unanimous consent he ought not to be found guilty.

Maryland.

15. That retrospective laws, punishing facts committed before the existence of such laws, and by them only declared criminal, are oppressive, unjust, and incompatible with liberty; wherefore no *ex post facto* law ought to be made.

Maryland.

17. That every freeman for (every) *any* injury done to him in his (goods, lands, or person,) *person or property*, ought to have remedy by the course of the law of the land, and ought to have justice and right, freely without sale, fully without any denial, and speedily without delay, according to the law of the land.

Maryland.

18. That the trial of facts where they arise, is one of the greatest securities of the lives, liberties, and estate of the people.

Maryland.

19. That in all criminal prosecutions, every man hath a right to be informed of the accusation against him, to have a copy of the indictment or charge in due time—if required—to prepare for his defence, to be allowed counsel, to be confronted with the witnesses against him, to have process for his witnesses, to examine the witnesses for and against him on oath, and to a speedy trial by an impartial jury, without whose unanimous consent he ought not to be found guilty.

15. That no man in the courts of common law ought to be compelled to give evidence against himself.

16. That excessive bails ought not to be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel nor unusual punishments inflicted.

17. That all warrants without oath to search suspected places, or to seize any person or his property, are grievous and oppressive; and all general warrants to search suspected places, or to apprehend all persons suspected, without naming or describing the place or any person in special, are illegal and ought not to be granted.

18. That a well-regulated Militia is the proper, natural, and safe defence of a free Government.

19. That standing armies are dangerous to liberty, and ought not to be raised or kept up without the consent of the Legislature.

20. That in all cases and at all times the military ought to be under strict subordination to and governed by the civil power.

Maryland.

20. That no man ought to be compelled to give evidence against himself in a court of common law, or in any other court, but in such cases (only) as have been usually practised in this State, *or may hereafter be directed by the Legislature.*

Maryland.

22. That excessive bail ought not to be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel or unusual punishments inflicted by the court of law.

Maryland.

23. That all warrants without oath, or affirmation (of a person conscientiously scrupulous of taking an oath), to search suspected places, or to seize any person, or (his) property, are grievous and oppressive; and all general warrants to search suspected places, or to apprehend (all persons suspected) *suspected persons*, without naming or describing the place, or (any) *the person in special*, are illegal, and ought not to be granted.

Maryland.

25. That a well-regulated Militia is the proper and natural defence of a free Government.

Maryland.

26. That standing armies are dangerous to liberty, and ought not to be raised or kept up without consent of the Legislature.

Maryland.

27. That in all cases and at all times the military ought to be under strict subordination to, and control of, the civil power.

21. That no soldier ought to be quartered in any house in time of peace without the consent of the owner; and in time of war, in such manner only as the Legislature shall direct.

22. That the independency and uprightness of judges are essential to the impartial administration of justice, and a great security to the rights and liberties of the people.

23. That the liberty of the press ought to be inviolably preserved.

Maryland.

28. That no soldier ought to be quartered in any house in time of peace without the consent of the owner, and in time of war in such manner only as the Legislature shall direct.

Maryland.

30. That the independency and uprightness of Judges are essential to the impartial administration of justice, and a great security to the rights and liberties of the people; wherefore . . . etc.

Maryland.

38. That the liberty of the press ought to be inviolably preserved.

Inasmuch as the Pennsylvania bill of rights was adopted on August 16, and was printed in the *Pennsylvania Gazette* of August 21, it must have been in the hands of the members of the Delaware convention when they assembled at Newcastle one week later, and it is, therefore, evident that Delaware drew upon Pennsylvania for certain of the provisions in framing her declaration of rights.¹

The question of priority between Delaware and Maryland is not so easily disposed of. The Delaware convention met at Newcastle on the twenty-seventh of August and issued its declaration of rights two weeks later, on September 11. The convention of Maryland assembled at Annapolis on August 14 and did not adopt a bill of rights until the third of November. But among the first matters to claim the attention of the Maryland delegates was this one of a bill of rights, and among the first committees elected was one to prepare a declaration of rights and a form of government. Within two weeks after the opening of the session, on the same day that the Delaware convention first assembled, that committee reported to the convention a "Declaration and Charter of Rights; which was read, and ordered to be printed for the consideration of the Members." This same draft, modified and amended by a committee of the whole house, was finally adopted as the declaration of rights for Maryland.²

¹ Not merely the three articles given in the above comparison, but also nine others, making practically the whole of the Pennsylvania declaration, are included in substance in Delaware's bill of rights.

² *Proceedings of the Maryland Convention*, August 17 and 27, and October 10—November 3.

It would seem, then, as if Maryland had preceded Delaware in the enunciation of those articles which their bills of rights have in common. But was such the case? A copy of the original draft presented by the committee on August 27 would at once settle the whole question, but unfortunately, although the draft was ordered to be "printed for the consideration of the people at large, and twelve copies thereof be sent without delay to each County in this State,"¹ a very thorough investigation of the accessible records and documents of Maryland has as yet failed to reveal any such copy.²

The committee's draft of a bill of rights was immediately ordered to be printed, but that was only for the use of the convention; it was not until September 17 that the order for its distribution throughout the state was passed, and six days before that date the Delaware declaration had been adopted. Therefore if the members of the Delaware convention had the benefit of Maryland's first draft in the preparation of their own bill of rights, it must have been received through private correspondence; and as in those times several days were required for the transmission of a letter from Annapolis to Wilmington, to have been of any service a copy must have been despatched immediately on the presentation of the committee's report, for only two weeks elapsed before the Delaware convention had completed its work. It is, therefore, improbable that Delaware could have profited by Maryland's declaration of rights. The members of the Maryland convention, on the other hand, had every opportunity to avail themselves of the Delaware bill of rights. It was printed in full in the *Maryland Gazette* of October 3, and they did not take up the consideration of their committee's report until October 10.³ And though they deliberated on this subject almost daily in committee of the whole, they did not complete their labors until the thirtieth,⁴ so that ample time was given for changes to any extent that the convention might have seen fit to make. And that very extensive changes were made appears from the motion of one of the members that before its final adoption the bill of rights be reprinted, because the draft "formerly printed for the consideration of the Members of the Convention had been materially altered by a Committee of the Whole House."⁵

Furthermore, it must be remembered that the rights which the

¹ *Ibid.*, September 17.

² The writer is under great obligations to Mr. St. George L. Sioussat of Baltimore for his prosecution of these investigations in that city, and also for valuable suggestions upon several points in this article.

³ *Proceedings of the Maryland Convention*, October 10.

⁴ *Ibid.*, October 10-30.

⁵ *Ibid.*, October 30.

states were proclaiming at that time were not regarded by them as provisions that were valid only within their respective boundaries; they were declaring principles of universal application.¹ Accordingly what Virginia had declared in her bill of rights Pennsylvania also declared, changing the language and adding somewhat, but omitting only such as apparently seemed superfluous, because they had already been affirmed in the English Bill of Rights. And the principles which Virginia and Pennsylvania had announced were included in the bills of rights of Delaware and Maryland. That Maryland's declaration included all of the rights proclaimed by Delaware, while Delaware's declaration did not include all of those proclaimed by Maryland, certainly argues in favor of a later date for the Maryland instrument.

If, then, we accept what seems to be the more probable, indeed almost certain conclusion that it was Maryland which was indebted to Delaware, and not Delaware to Maryland, for those rights which the two states enunciated in such similar language, and if we decide that it was when the Maryland convention was considering the bill of rights in committee of the whole that the articles of the Delaware declaration were inserted, we have a ready explanation of the fact that the draft as reported from that committee bears a closer resemblance to the Delaware bill of rights than the form finally adopted, after the articles had been somewhat modified on a second consideration.

MAX FARRAND.

¹ Bancroft, *History of the United States* (Author's Last Revision), IV. 419.

THE ORIGIN OF GENET'S PROJECTED ATTACK ON LOUISIANA AND THE FLORIDAS

FROM the point of view of the foreign relations and particularly of the maintenance and expansion of the territorial basis of the United States, the decade from 1793 to 1803 was a critical period in American history. To one who appreciates the importance of the possession of the Mississippi Valley and its approaches in the history and destiny of the United States, these years are alive with interest. It was in this decade that Wayne's victory turned the tide against the Indians in the Northwest, and Jay's treaty relieved it of English occupation; then it was that Spain's intrigues with Indian scalping parties and Kentucky malcontents, her claims in the Southwest, and her closure of the Mississippi to the products of the West, came to an end. At the close of the decade the nation, having thus secured its flanks, took its gigantic march across the Mississippi by the Louisiana Purchase.

One of the gravest of the dangers of this period, however, has not received the attention which its importance warrants. The mission of Genet has been chiefly considered as a matter of his own personality, in the effects which his enthusiasm and his democratic societies produced upon party crystallization, and in regard to his demands for money and the use which he made of our ports.¹ His picturesque effrontery in lecturing the government and his threatened appeal from Washington to the people, have perhaps concealed from us the most important feature of his mission, namely the desire of the French Republic to form connections with the frontiersmen of America and to seize Louisiana, the Floridas and Canada as a part of the same enthusiastic crusade for liberty that carried the French armies across the European frontiers in the early days of the Revolution. In this case France reckoned upon the active support or the connivance of the American people, and particularly upon the irate Kentuckians, to aid her in repelling the hated Spaniard from the approaches to the Mississippi and perhaps from both Americas. It was an attractive programme. The enthusiasm for revolutionary France, and the Western resentment

¹ Dr. von Holst, *Constitutional History of the United States*, I. 113-120, has used DeWitt, *Thomas Jefferson*, to put the main purpose of France in a clearer light; but he does not go at any length into the Western intrigue.

against the power that closed the Mississippi, made it possible that this fierce young French Republic, strong with the zeal of the Revolution, might be able to succeed the decadent Spanish monarchy on the Gulf of Mexico, and hold the gratitude and friendship of the men of the West. What this transfer under such conditions might have meant, European history in the years that soon followed may enable us to guess. But in the way of this outcome stood George Washington. By throwing the weight of a vigorous policy and his powerful influence in favor of strict adherence to the duty of neutrality, he blocked the plan of France and performed one of the greatest of his services to America.

It is not strange that France in her revolutionary renaissance, and when war was about to be declared upon England and Spain, should have turned her eyes toward the remains of her colonial glory in Canada and Louisiana. Indeed it is one of the significant elements in her policy during the War of Independence that she never lost sight of the weakness of Spain, or of the advisability of keeping the United States a dependent ally, restricted within the limits of the Alleghanies. Her statesmen were well aware of the looseness of the federal bond in the Confederation and of the disaffection of the West. Memoirs for the recovery of Louisiana were framed for presentation to the government of the Old Régime. In 1787 Lord Dorchester sent home from Canada a copy of a memoir¹ presented to the French minister in the United States and by him forwarded to his court. The object of its author was to induce France to retake Louisiana. He argued that separation was the inevitable destiny of the West. "Unity," he said, "is broken by the Mountains. Those beyond seek for a new support and they offer to the power which will welcome them, advantages which will before long efface those which America, as it now is, could promise. These may be seen at a glance, from the Appalaches to the mountains of New Mexico, and from the Lakes of Canada to the mouth of the Mississippi. Here is a zone of the globe capable of containing fifty million inhabitants, situated in a continuous plain, inclosed in the same compass, of which all the parts have a close connection, a common and indivisible point of trade and navigation. In a few years will be born a new policy, and it is a colony not yet perceived which will hatch the germ. It requires a protector; the first who will stretch out his arms to it will have made the greatest acquisition that could be desired in this New World. Fortunate my country

¹ *Report Canadian Archives*, 1890, pp. 108-117. See also *Report of Historical Manuscripts Commission*, in the *Report of the American Historical Association*, 1896, pp. 946, 947.

if she does not let this moment escape, one of those not presented twice."

This discontent of the West and the weakness of the ties that bound it to the coast had also been shown in proposals by malcontents to England¹ and to Spain. General Wilkinson, the most consummate artist in treason that the nation ever possessed, received Spanish money for his efforts to carry Kentucky from the Union, and even George Rogers Clark, the conqueror of the Illinois country in the famous campaign of 1778 and 1779, had desired in 1788 to take service under Spain in return for a liberal land grant. Clark was disgusted with the neglect which Virginia and the United States gave to his claims. His friend and adviser in this period was Dr. James O'Fallon, a Revolutionary soldier, who later married Clark's youngest sister. One of the famous Yazoo land companies² which purchased from Georgia a part of her western claims, was the South Carolina Yazoo Company, of which the active agent was this Dr. O'Fallon. Since the colony was to be located in the region of the present Vicksburg, in territory claimed by Spain, O'Fallon attempted to conciliate that power by assuring Governor Miro that the colonists had been led to "consent to be the slaves of Spain, under the appearance of a free and independent colony, forming a rampart for the adjoining Spanish territories and establishing with them an eternal reciprocal alliance, offensive and defensive." In this proposed separation from the Union, it was rumored

¹ Professor J. F. Jameson has called my attention to an interesting proposition of this period made to the British authorities.

In a letter of Phineas Bond, British Consul in Philadelphia, written to the Foreign Secretary, the Duke of Leeds, and dated January 3, 1791, he says: "In case of a rupture with Spain, my Lord, it may become an object of consideration with Government how far the Spanish settlements on the Mississippi near the mouth of that river might be accessible to [a] force collected near the Ohio and conveyed down the rivers in craft calculated for that purpose. Perhaps it might be deemed too hazardous an undertaking to engage in an enterprise of this sort without the concurrence of the United States, nor could such a concurrence be expected but upon [the basis] of stipulations reciprocally beneficial yet it may [be] expedient to observe, my Lord, that the western settl[ements] have constantly murmured at the restrictions laid upon their exports, thro' the medium of the Mississippi, by the Court of Spain. It is but reasonable to suppose . . . would favor nay co-operate in any measure that m[ight] tend to secure them a free trade which the uninterr[upted] passage of the Mississippi would effectually establish.

"The settlers, my Lord, upon the whole frontier of the United States are a hardy race of men. Adventurers by profession, and ready to seize every opportunity of profit or employment. I could not presume, my Lord, to delineate the plan of such an enterprize tho' I can not restrain a suggestion which may be improved by others more conversant with subjects of this nature." Compare England's intrigue with Miranda in John Adams' administration.

² Haskins, "Yazoo Land Companies," *Papers of the American Historical Association*, V. 69, 71, 72.

that George Rogers Clark had been selected as chief in command of the battalion which O'Fallon organized. In 1790 "it was expected in Lexington that General Scott would take five hundred families to the settlement and that Wilkinson and Sevier would follow, each with a thousand fighting men and their families. General McDowell accompanies the Frankliners from the Long Island, where they are to embark with 300 from the back parts of North Carolina and 200 with Capt. Alston from Cumberland." Washington's proclamation and the prospect of the use of force, together with Spanish opposition, put an end to the project; but the reports about the expedition reveal unmistakable symptoms. The frontiersmen were about to advance. Their produce was useless if the Mississippi were closed. They were weary of the incessant Indian war on their borders. The federal government discouraged their attacks on the savages and appeared indifferent to the closing of navigation by Spain. To the frontiersmen the essential thing was relief from this intolerable situation. The new government had not yet approved its value to them; the future of a united nation extending from Atlantic to Pacific appealed less to their imagination than did the pressing need of themselves possessing the portals of the great valley which they occupied. There appeared to be two solutions of the difficulty, either to come to an agreement with Spain, which would open the Mississippi, stop the Indian raids and furnish them with liberal land-grants, or to fight their way out. In either case Spain would not long have withstood this hardy backwood stock. While thus the West seethed with intrigues, with projects of colonization in Spanish territory and with yearnings for war, there came the reports of the wars of the French Revolution and perhaps intimations of the policy of France with respect to the Spanish dependencies in America.¹

It is, therefore, not at all surprising that at Christmas time, in 1792, General Clark and Dr. O'Fallon concerted a plan for an attack on Louisiana under the French flag. This proposition, together with a private letter from O'Fallon to his friend Thomas Paine, then a member of the Convention, would seem to have reached France before Genet sailed.² In the meantime, and entirely

¹ Sorel, *L'Europe et la Révolution Française*, III. 157; Jefferson, *Writings*, ed. Ford, I. 216.

² At least that careful Western student, Dr. Lyman C. Draper, in a note to the George Rogers Clark Manuscripts, in the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, mentions that Paine wrote in answer to O'Fallon, from Passy, February 17, 1793, conveying the idea that Clark's application had gone through the medium of the French minister to the United States and that the proposal had been laid before the Provisional Executive Council of the Republic. However this may have been, Clark, as we shall see later, learning of Genet's mission, wrote to him (February 2, 1793), and this letter was received by the minister on

independently, the French government was devoting attention to the project of operations in America. Brissot de Warville, one of the leaders of the Girondins, or Brissotins, was a warm admirer of America. In 1788 he had traveled in the United States, and he brought the fruits of his observations into his *Nouveau Voyage dans les États-Unis* (Paris, 1791). He had noted the discontent of the Westerners over Spain's closure of the Mississippi. "They are determined," he wrote, "to open it with good will or by force; and it would not be in the power of Congress to moderate their ardor. Men who have shook off the yoke of Great Britain, and who are masters of the Ohio and the Mississippi, cannot conceive that the insolence of a handful of Spaniards can think of shutting rivers and seas against a hundred thousand free Americans. The slightest quarrel will be sufficient to throw them into a flame; and if ever the Americans shall march toward New Orleans, it will infallibly fall into their hands." Brissot pressed for the war with Austria, and as the current of the revolution hastened towards a general European conflict, he became more and more interested in the problems of foreign relations. Saint Just afterward declared, in his report on the proscribed Girondin deputies (July 9, 1793), that "the attention of Brissot extended to the other hemisphere, Brissot ruled the Council." It was partly due to his influence that Lebrun was made minister of foreign relations in the summer of 1792. Another intimate friend of Brissot was Clavière, the Genevese banker, who became minister of finance in the spring of the same year. He had accompanied Brissot in one of his journeys through America, and was, with him, the author of the works, *De la France et des États-Unis* (London, 1787) and *Commerce of America with Europe*. Otto, chief secretary of a division of Lebrun's office, had been private secretary to Luzerne, during his American mission, and was later chargé d'affaires in the United States, from which he returned in 1792. Otto declared, in 1797, that Brissot, who had unlimited influence in the diplomatic circle, proposed Genet as minister to the United States.¹ Thus the innermost circles of the Girondist authorities were strongly affected by American influence.

Lebrun was now considering the probability of a war with Spain; Miranda, who had visited the United States soon after the War of Independence, and whose South American exploits were to make him famous, had come to confer with him about the project of a

his arrival in this country; and with his answer (July 12), Genet forwarded Paine's reply to Dr. O'Fallon's letter. Conway, *Life of Paine*, II. 156; *Report of the American Historical Association*, 1896, pp. 967, n. 2; 986, 987, 996, 1007.

¹ Archives des Affaires Étrangères, États Unis., Vol. 47, folio 401.

revolution in the Spanish colonies. Brissot desired to make use of Miranda, aided by over 30,000 San Domingo troops. But more moderate plans were chosen. Lebrun decided to send Genet to the United States, with a secret mission to foment the revolution (Lebrun to Dumouriez, November 6, 1792).¹ Jefferson afterwards noted that Col. W. S. Smith,² who left Paris November 9, 1792, reported that they were sending Genet here, and that "the ministers told him they meant to begin the attack [on the Spanish colonies] at the mouth of the Mississippi, and to sweep along the bay of Mexico, southwardly, and that they would have no objections to our incorporating into our government the two Floridas." Dumouriez wrote to Lebrun (November 30, 1792) that "once masters of Holland we shall be strong enough to crush England, particularly by interesting the United States in sustaining our colonies, and in executing a superb project of General Miranda."³

A vast and startling project, indeed! sweeping into a single system the campaigns of France in Europe, the discontented frontiersmen of the Mississippi valley, and the revolutionary unrest that was before long to give independence to Spanish America. The historical possibilities of the great design are overwhelming.

Around Brissot and his party leaders in the fall of 1792 and the spring of 1793, there were also gathered a group of well known Americans. Among them was the famous Thomas Paine, keen of scent for revolutionary breezes, whose relations with his old-time friend in the American War for Independence, Dr. O'Fallon, we have already mentioned, and here, too, was Joel Barlow, the poet, whose *Vision of Columbus* lives, at least in the history of American literature, and the promoter, whose notorious Scioto Land Company

¹Sorel, *L'Europe et la Révolution Française*, III. 157; *Atlantic Monthly*, May, 1860, p. 589.

²The Minister of Public Contributions reports to the Provisory Executive Council, January 4, 1793: "I have given information to the citizen Genet of the offers made by Col. Smith, of New York, to procure the republic not only the reimbursement of what remains due from the United States, although not yet payable, but also the application of it, either to supplies for the army, or wheat flour and salted provisions in augmentation of our internal supplies." This proposal was approved by the council, in a letter to Colonel Smith, November 7, 1792; and the minister notes that by the time of his report (considered on January 4, 1793) Smith had gone to England. *American State Papers, Foreign Relations*, I. 144. Jefferson's minute of the interview with Col. Smith was dated February 20, 1793 (*Jefferson, Writings*, I. 216). Col. W. S. Smith was the son-in-law of John Adams. He had been aide-de-camp to Washington, and secretary of legation under Adams in London, where he was on intimate terms with Miranda. His connection with the Miranda project of 1798, when Great Britain took somewhat the rôle towards Spanish America that France now essayed, is well known. See John Adams, *Works*, I. 679; VIII., X., *passim*; *Edinburgh Review*, XIII. 277 ff. Col. Smith may have given Jefferson an understanding of the inception of the plan.

³Sorel, III. 175.

lives in the history of American settlement. Brissot aided him in this land scheme, which lured unfortunate French emigrants to Galipolis, and, later, Barlow was the translator of Brissot's *Travels*.¹ Both Paine² and Barlow were enjoying their recent honors as naturalized citizens of France. Gilbert Imlay was another of the group,—that soldier of the American Revolution, and of fortune, who had brought his Kentucky observations into the *Topographical Description of the Western Territories of America* (London, 1792). He was living with Mary Wollstonecraft, afterwards the mother of Shelley's wife (Mary Godwin), and his perfidy is embalmed in her *Letters to Imlay*. In Paine's home, an old mansion of Madame de Pompadour, we find, a little later, gatherings in which the Brissots, Bonneville, Barlow, Imlay, Mary Wollstonecraft and the Rolands met. Less influential, perhaps, but active also, in promoting the interest of the government in American affairs was Stephen Sayre, a native of Long Island, New York, who after graduating at Princeton had become a banker in London, and later, sheriff. His enthusiasm for the War of Independence ruined his fortunes in London and he attached himself for a time to Franklin and to Arthur Lee. At this time we find him, with Beaupois, a French officer who had served in Poland, engaged in promoting the plan of an expedition against Louisiana. Lyonnet, a Frenchman who had lived in New Orleans, and who had influence with the Gironde leaders, contributed valuable information concerning the discontented settlers in the old capital of Louisiana. Such were the influences at work in Paris at the period when George Rogers Clark, at the Falls of the Ohio, was brooding over the wrongs imposed on him by the Virginia legislature³ and considering plans for expatriation and the reduction of Louisiana.

It was in the summer of 1792 that there returned to Paris, fresh from his Russian mission, that ruddy, bustling brother of Madame Campan, the friend and companion of Marie Antoinette. Genet had been destined for Holland, but, as we have seen, he was determined upon in November for the United States, when Lebrun and Dumouriez were embracing all Spanish America in their designs. Genet himself seems afterwards to have desired it to be understood that the friendly relations which his family bore to the Queen had led to his selection as agent to carry out the plan of some of the Girondists for deporting Louis to the United States and thus avoid-

¹ See Barlow's proposal in 1793 to take the contract for the conquest of Louisiana himself, on a business basis, *American Historical Review*, III. 508.

² Conway, *Life of Paine*, II. 64.

³ Clark learned of the failure of his claims in the Virginia courts and legislature in November, 1792. 53 Clark MSS., 81.

ing execution by exile. Mr. Moncure D. Conway quotes from Genet's papers in his possession this interesting statement: "Roux Facillac, who had been very intimate in my father's family at Versailles, met me one morning and wished me to spend the evening at Lebrun's, where I had been invited. He accompanied me there and we met Brissot, Guadet, Leonnet [Lyonnet?], Ducos, Fauchet, Thomas Paine and most of the Gironde leaders . . . Tom Paine, who did not pretend to understand French, took no part in the conversation, and sat quietly sipping his claret. 'Ask Paine, Genet,' said Brissot, 'what effect the execution of Capet would have in America?' Paine replied to my inquiry by simply saying, 'bad, very bad.' The next day Paine presented to the convention his celebrated letter demanding in the name of Liberty and the people of the United States that Louis should be sent to the United States. . . . 'Genet,' continued Lebrun, 'how would you like to go to the United States and take Capet and his family with you?'"¹

This anecdote is interesting as showing the kind of gatherings in progress at this time, though it bears internal evidence of apparent inaccuracy, at least, since Paine's speech was made on the fifteenth of January, 1793, and Genet's instructions had been first made out in December, although they were supplemented by additional instructions on January 17.²

Genet's instructions³ recite that at the moment when he is sent to the United States, a rupture with England and Spain is imminent. He is, therefore, to endeavor to secure a treaty establishing a close concert for the extension of the empire of liberty, guaranteeing the sovereignty of the peoples, and punishing the powers which have an exclusive commercial and colonial system by declaring that the vessels of these powers shall not be received in the ports of the contracting nations. This compact, it was urged, would conduce rapidly to the freeing of Spanish America, to the opening of the navigation of the Mississippi to the inhabitants of Kentucky, "to the deliverance of our ancient brothers of Louisiana from the tyrannic yoke of Spain, and perhaps to the uniting to the American constellation of the fair star of Canada." In case, however, the course of the United States is wavering and timid, and if they do not determine to make common cause with France, Genet is to take all measures which his position permits, to propagate the principles of

¹ Conway, *Writings of Thomas Paine*, IV., p. xii.

² On the sixteenth of January, Clavière wrote two letters to Jefferson regarding Genet's mission. Jefferson Correspondence, Department of State, Series 2, Vol. 16, No. 88; *Bulletin of Bureau of Rolls*, No. 8, p. 119.

³ *Report of American Historical Association*, 1896, pp. 957, 960; Aulard, *Recueil des Actes du Comité de Salut Public*, I. 361, 393 n., 478.

the French Revolution in Louisiana and in the other provinces of America adjoining the United States. The Kentuckians, who had long burned with the desire for the navigation of the Mississippi, it was noted, would probably second Genet's efforts without compromising Congress. Genet was accordingly authorized to keep agents in Kentucky, and to send them to Louisiana. He was also to make the expenditures which he judged necessary for the execution of this project. Blank brevets of officers up to the rank of captain, for bestowal on Indian chiefs, were entrusted to him.

Delays in getting to sea kept him at the harbor of Rochefort¹ until about the last week of February, 1793.² Between the date of Lebrun's letter to Dumouriez (November 6, 1792) on the day of the victory of Jemmapes (announcing the purpose to attack the Spanish colonies), and the time of Genet's departure, important events had occurred. The declaration by the French people of their readiness to wage war for all peoples upon their kings³ had been followed by the execution of Louis.⁴ Four days later the Executive Council assigned to Brissot a report on the possibility of an expedition against the Spanish dependencies.⁵ On the thirtieth of January, the council had ordered that Genet's departure be hastened.⁶ War was declared against England on the first of February, and the declaration of war against Spain⁷ was inevitable. The new minister to the United States left France, fired with the enthusiasm and the great designs of the days of Dumouriez.

It was forty-eight days before Genet, driven out of his course by adverse winds, reached Charleston.⁸ In the meantime the foreign office was receiving plans from the Americans in Paris for effecting the reduction of Louisiana by the aid of the Kentucky riflemen. Several of these plans were in the hands of the government before the date of Genet's departure. His instructions and later actions in America are therefore to be read in the light of this fact.

One of the earliest as well as one of the most interesting of the communications is an anonymous draft, endorsed 1792.⁹ The writer says that he had hoped, in vain, to interest the old French government in the recovery of Louisiana, and he refers to a memoir con-

¹ Near La Rochelle.

² Genet to Lebrun, April 16, 1793, Archives, États-Unis, Vol. 27, folio 217, and appendix to DeWitt, *Thomas Jefferson* (Paris, 1861); Hamilton, *Republic*, V. 247.

³ November 19, 1792.

⁴ January 21, 1793.

⁵ Aulard, *Recueil*, II. 10; III. 82.

⁶ *Ibid.*, II. 27.

⁷ Made March 9, 1793.

⁸ April 8, 1793.

⁹ *Report of American Historical Association*, 1896, p. 945.

taining his views, the result of researches during five years. Putting aside as chimerical the Miranda idea of revolutionizing the more southern regions of Spanish America, he urges the Louisiana project as easy to carry out, owing to the weakness of the garrisons (not over 1500 men, he believed) and the temper of the French inhabitants. He also points out the value of the conquest as a diversion which would alarm Spain into devoting troops to the defense of her other American frontiers, and as a means of checking Spanish privateers. The measures for inaugurating this movement were, in the opinion of the writer, secretly to send three or four French military men, including Lyonnet, to Philadelphia; to send an emissary by way of Philadelphia to New Orleans; to give to Genet the powers concerning the employment of these commissioners and charge him with the responsibility of the expedition; and to send revolutionary agents to Kentucky, to the colonies of Marietta and Scioto and Cumberland, promising the free navigation of the Mississippi. He would give to the expedition the guise of a filibustering raid in order to avoid compromising the government of Kentucky, and he advised that General Wilkinson (!) be made the commander-in-chief. The emissaries were to assemble five hundred men at different points on the Ohio, brought together by hope of booty and of confiscated Spanish lands. To cover these proceedings they were to take the appearance of an expedition against the Indians. The commander-in-chief should be empowered to make a treaty of alliance between France and Louisiana. The total expense he reckoned at 400,000 livres. Taking up the important question of the relation of this expedition to the United States, the author puts the questions, whether the leaders of the Republic should be acquainted with the plans; whether Louisiana ought to be united to France or to the United States; and how to avoid compromising the neutrality of the United States. Ten years before, he says, America would have welcomed the independence of Louisiana as infinitely desirable, for then they had the enthusiasm of liberty; but the enjoyment of it has made them calmer, and they no longer regard liberty like lovers, but like married persons; reflection guides them, but it cools them. He then develops the argument that nature has destined a separation of the West, and that Congress is reluctant to secure the navigation of the Mississippi from Spain, lest this separation be facilitated. While, therefore, Genet ought adroitly to sound the disposition of the leaders of the government regarding the union of Louisiana with the United States, the envoy should speak of this merely as desirable, and should dispose them to receive with satisfaction the news of French success. By attrib-

uting the expedition to the disquietude of French settlers on the Scioto, Genet would enable the government to disavow the expedition and save the neutrality of the United States. The orders of Congress to courts of justice to act against the leaders of the invasion, on the remote frontiers, were not to be feared. He reaches the conclusion that the expedition should ignore the United States, and that the co-operating force should be found in Kentucky and along the Ohio; and he names among those whose aid is desirable, Wilkinson, Tardiveau (the brother of the late commandant of Kaskaskia) and Brackenridge. He leaves the future relations of Louisiana to be settled by the situation of France after the peace, but he expresses his opposition to uniting it to the United States.

In the same year Captain Imlay contributed observations, in which he enforced the commercial and strategic importance of Louisiana to France and her West Indian islands.¹ The expedition could, in his opinion, be carried out by France for 750,000 livres, but Imlay adds that if this is too considerable an expenditure, Genet should be left to his discretion to find men in the West to undertake the expedition at their own cost and risk. This he declares to be entirely possible if they are assured that France will furnish assistance.²

From these plans and instructions prior to Genet's departure, it is evident that whatever Genet's impetuosity and maladroitness may have done to damage the French project, he cannot be charged with having undertaken an unauthorized expedition. The essential features of the plan he attempted to carry out were those of the government and its advisers. His mistakes were of method rather than of object.³ Nevertheless, Genet was not without warnings from the Minister of Foreign Affairs.⁴ Lebrun distinctly cautioned him that the cold character of Americans only warms by degrees, and that the negotiations with the government must be secret. He was advised to have entire confidence in the sentiments of the President and Jefferson, Butler and Madison. His instructions, furthermore, enjoined upon him to follow scrupulously the forms established for official communications between the government and the agents of foreign states, and to give no offense with regard to pro-

¹ *Report of American Historical Association*, 1896, p. 953; *American Historical Review*, III, 491.

² Imlay mentions a report on the expedition presented to the Executive Committee by Lebrun; and the value of Imlay's advice regarding the expedition is vouched for by Brissot. *American Historical Review*, III, 503.

³ Lebrun to Genet, March 10, 1793; DeWitt, *Jefferson*, 517. Lebrun was opposed to the United States securing the freedom of the Mississippi by negotiation.

⁴ Lebrun to Genet, February 24, 1793; Archives, États-Unis, Vol. 37, fo. 132.

visions of the Constitution of the United States. But he was advised to exert an influence on public sentiment, and he was informed that the indirect ways were more useful than the official approaches. The difficulty with these requirements lay, not merely in Genet's impetuous character, and the party conflicts in America; it lay also in the fact that, as the event proved, Washington pursued a genuine and vigorous policy of neutrality, and thus Genet had to choose between abandonment of his project and a conflict with the authorities. The President neither consented to aid France, nor to engage in an intrigue which provided for avowing neutrality, while permitting the frontier to follow the flag of France. The people, moreover, in the last resort, were loyal to Washington.

The plans submitted to the French authorities increased in number and detail in the early days of March, when that nation declared war against Spain. Among others, the former resident of New Orleans, Lyonnet, presented elaborate expositions of the advantages of Louisiana and the condition of the Spanish posts along the Mississippi. He believed that Louisiana should be joined to the United States. Six persons, he thought, should be sent to Philadelphia to proceed to Kentucky on the pretext of buying lands, but really to arrange matters in the West. He recommended Tardiveau as able to suggest useful men in Kentucky, and he wrote: "At the head of these filibusters of the woods, must be placed General [Clark], who in the late war took Vincennes, among other posts. His name alone is worth hosts, and there is no American who has not confidence in him." Among the expenses he notes that much must be spent for drink, "for the Americans only talk of war when vis-à-vis with a bowl."¹

On the fourth of March, Sayre and Beaupoils, already mentioned, together with Percyrat, offered to Lebrun a plan,² the substance of which they had communicated to Dumouriez, probably in the early summer of 1792, while he was still minister of foreign affairs. Referring, doubtless, to the Miranda project, they declare that, in the present juncture, a fleet and a formidable army cannot properly be devoted to the expedition, but they present a plan which would also have the ultimate aim of seizing Mexico and creating a revolt in South America.³ The uprising in Louisiana, which their project was designed to effect, would afford a beginning for such further designs, in harmony with the larger proposals, as might be

¹ Archives, Louisiane et Florides, 1792 à 1803, Vol. 7, docs. 4 and 5; Espagne, Vol. 635, docs. 316, 317; Vol. 636, folios 37, 101, 205; *American Historical Review*, III. 496-505.

² *Report of American Historical Association*, 1896, p. 951.

³ Compare *id.*, p. 915, and *American Historical Review*, III. 496.

deemed expedient by the government ; and it would in itself compel Spain to send vessels and troops to America to intercept a general revolt of the Spanish provinces. In Kentucky, they declared, were a large part of Washington's officers and soldiers, and the desire for the freedom of the Mississippi, and the hope of glory and profit from such an expedition against Spain, would attract them. A few boats, batteries and munitions, together with supplies for two months for 3000 men, were needed. The boats could be built at the Falls of the Ohio. The French of Louisiana would embrace the opportunity to revolt ; but if the taking of New Orleans was not deemed important, the tributaries of the Mississippi would open a way to Mexico, and the Panuco Indians, lately ill-treated by Spain, could be counted on to aid. An important consideration, in the opinion of the memorialists, was that such an expedition, made without the consent of the United States, would lead inevitably to an attitude on the part of England and Spain which would force the United States to take part with France, particularly since the Americans knew that the English were the authors of the Indian war then in progress in the United States. An expenditure of 280,000 livres, exclusive of artillery and ammunition, would suffice for the expedition, and the agent of the Republic could draw upon the treasury of the United States to meet these expenses ; the modesty of this sum would conceal the secret.

While these plans were offered to Lebrun, a project for the formation of a committee to arrange for the expedition was also considered. For membership in this the proposition suggested : Joel Barlow, "a true friend of liberty, a philosopher, and pure in his morals," who might have, under Genet, the general direction of the matter, as well as the management of the funds ; Sayre, who (owing, perhaps, to his London sojourn), should be well watched ; and Beaupoils and Lyonnet. These four were to be sent to Philadelphia to begin the formation of the committee, having first concerted their plans with Otto. This project also provided that a part of the money due from the United States to France should be devoted to the enterprise. It was expected that these men would prepare the revolt of the Spanish colonies, which Miranda would complete, and they were to act in concert with a Mexican who had written to Clavière regarding the expedition.

Some contemporary comments¹ upon several of these plans (made apparently by one of the French authorities), declare that Mexico and the Spanish colonies should not be thought of again. And, in fact, in the United States as well as in France, the larger aspects of

¹ *Report of American Historical Association*, 1896, p. 945, n. 3.

the original design seem at least to have been left to await the outcome of the operations in Louisiana and the Floridas.

But in France domestic and foreign troubles followed fast in the weeks that succeeded the declaration of war against Spain. The loss of Belgium, the defection of Dumouriez, the revolt in La Vendée, the formation of the Committee of Public Safety, and the struggle between the Girondins and the Mountain, culminated in the downfall of the Girondins on the second of June, 1793. Genet had, therefore, hardly reached Philadelphia and begun active operations, when his party friends were in prison or in flight. That awful summer, with civil war, military reverses, a dozen countries in arms against France, and the reign of terror in her midst, was no time for attention to remote or widely extended plans of conquest in another hemisphere, even if the Jacobins had desired to sustain Genet. The interest in the expedition turns, therefore, to the United States.

At Charleston, Genet at once communicated the plan that had been drawn up to Governor Moultrie, the well-known Revolutionary leader. Genet and the consul, Mangourit, both report that a complete confidence existed between them and "this venerable veteran, the sincere friend of our Revolution." Genet informed Lebrun in his first dispatch¹ that Moultrie had rendered all the good offices in his power, permitting him to arm privateers, and furnishing him useful information on various parts of his instructions. Moultrie favored combined action by the United States, and was impressed by the advantage that the freedom of Louisiana would afford in checking the Indian attacks instigated by Spain,² and in opening the Mississippi. Mangourit impressed upon him the idea that all that France would gain from the expedition would be the weakening of the enemy, while the substantial advantages would be with the United States.³ A few days later the consul visited Savannah to talk with General Mackintosh and others afterward engaged in the expedition against Florida. So far from concealing the purpose of this visit from Moultrie, he induced that obliging official to grant him letters of introduction. Throughout his correspondence, Mangourit shows a steady confidence in Moultrie's good will, even after the latter became dissatisfied with Genet, and officially proclaimed the policy of neutrality for South Carolina.⁴ Moultrie's private secretary, Freneau, was said to be a brother of Jefferson's translating clerk, the editor of the *National Gazette*.

¹ April 16, 1793, Archives, États-Unis, Vol. 37, fo. 217; De Witt, *Thomas Jefferson*, Appendix.

² *Report of American Historical Association*, 1896, p. 987.

³ Archives, États-Unis, Supp. Vol. 5, doct. 9 (1790-1813), Mangourit to Genet, April 24, 1793.

⁴ *American State Papers, Indian Affairs*, I. 310.

Thus Genet's brief visit to Charleston had sufficed to set in action the Florida side of the intrigue, which he left in the hands of the energetic Mangourit. While the minister was travelling by land to Philadelphia, amid the jubilations of the democratic admirers of France, Washington and his cabinet were considering the attitude of the United States toward neutrality and our treaty with France. As early as the twentieth of February, 1793, as we have seen,¹ Jefferson had received from Col. Smith intimations of the French project and of Genet's mission. On the seventeenth of January, Clavière had written to him of the minister's coming, and on the twenty-third of March, Jefferson, with Washington's approval, had drafted instructions² for Carmichael and Short, our commissioners to Spain. These instructions mention the desire of France to offer independence to the Spanish-American colonies, beginning with those on the Mississippi, and that she would not object to our receiving those of the east side into our confederacy. The proper course, Jefferson observed, was to keep ourselves free to act according to circumstances and not to guarantee the Spanish colonies. The idea of providing for a guaranty of Louisiana on condition of the cession of the Floridas was abandoned, because when it was originally thought of we apprehended it would be seized by Great Britain, who would thus completely encircle us with her colonies and fleets. "This danger," he adds, "is now removed by the concert between Great Britain and Spain; and the times will soon enough give independence, and consequently free commerce to our neighbors, without our risking the involving of ourselves in a war for them."

The proclamation issued by Washington on the twenty-second of April required the pursuance of a conduct friendly and impartial toward the belligerent powers. Jefferson, while acquiescing as a matter of expediency,³ nevertheless regarded the proclamation as pusillanimous.⁴ Large masses of the people of Philadelphia were bitterly opposed to the President's policy, and rioting was imminent at the very seat of government. This was, then, the situation at the opening of Genet's mission. The Democratic-Republican forces of the country desired a liberal construction of our treaty obligations with France, and the most friendly relations, if not positive alliance, with her. The fomentation of Indian attacks upon our southwestern frontier by Spain, to say nothing of her stubborn attitude regarding

¹ Jefferson, *Writings*, I. 216; *Works*, ed. Washington, III. 534.

² Jefferson, *Writings*, VI. 206.

³ Jefferson to Madison, June 23, 1793, *Works*, III. 591.

⁴ Jefferson to Madison, May 19, 1793, *Works*, III. 562.

the Mississippi, had led the government to serious protests in the fall of 1792, and by the early summer of 1793 war seemed inevitable.¹ Washington asked of Knox,² in the middle of June, information regarding the Spanish strength in Florida to provide for the event of embroilment; and Jefferson wrote Monroe at the end of that month that war with Spain was absolutely inevitable.³ As early as the autumn⁴ of 1792 Jefferson had expressed his apprehension that Spain and England had a common understanding on the frontiers of the United States; and the declaration of war by England and Spain against France, together with the complaints of English intrigues among the Indians by our settlers on the Northwest did not tend to lessen the apprehension. In short, Genet's opportunity was an ideal one.

But almost from the first he alienated the President and even rendered the support of his friends difficult. He found Washington cold and impassive. He asked in vain that the United States should anticipate the payment of their debt to France (about \$2,300,000) and he engaged, in conformity with his instructions, to accept certificates to be expended among the various states for supplies and munitions of war. These were to be devoted, in part, to the provisioning of the French islands; but it needs no penetration to perceive that the plan was admirably suited to cover all kinds of expenditures from this fund among the frontiersmen for the purposes of the expedition. The federal government declined the proposition, and Genet soon practically abandoned his effort to win the administration, and turned to intrigues.

On his arrival he found awaiting him the letter of George Rogers Clark, written February 2, 1793, from the Falls of the Ohio.⁵ In this letter the frontier leader recounted his services, his investigations into Spanish defences in the Mississippi valley, his possession of friends in those places, and his relations to the Indians. He declared that with four hundred men he could expel the Spaniards from upper Louisiana, and with eight hundred execute the same operation upon New Orleans. He asked naval assistance of two or three frigates and three thousand pounds sterling for the expedition.⁶ Genet also received, a few days after his arrival at Philadel-

¹ Jefferson to Carmichael and Short, October 14, 1792, *Works*, III. 474.

² Washington to Jefferson, June 14, 1793, *Washington's Writings*, XII. 297.

³ Jefferson, *Works*, IV. 6.

⁴ Jefferson to Washington, September 9, 1792, *Works*, III. 459.

⁵ *Report of American Historical Association*, 1896, pp. 967, 971.

⁶ Another draft, in the Clark MSS. (*ibid.*, p. 967) dated February 5 or 3 (for the date shows emendation), proposed to raise fifteen hundred men out of Kentucky, Cumberland, the Holston settlements and the Illinois. As many more French of the Spanish settlements would flock to his standard. With the first he could take Louisiana, begin-

phia, two memoirs from André Michaux,¹ the French botanist, to whom Jefferson had in January of that year given instructions in behalf of the American Philosophical Society for the transcontinental exploration which he proposed.² But while Genet was holding his first conference with Jefferson, Michaux was engaged in drawing up his observations on the French colonies in America for a different kind of exploration.

The month of June was a busy one for the French minister. Finding Michaux's exploring tour a convenient cover for his own designs, he selected him as his agent to go to Kentucky, and he conferred with John Brown, the Kentucky congressman,³ who gave Michaux letters of introduction to Governor Shelby of Kentucky, and to George Rogers Clark. Genet wrote to Lebrun on the nineteenth of this month⁴ that in spite of "old Washington," who "had hindered his progress in a thousand ways," he had won popular enthusiasm, and was secretly pressing for the calling of Congress, where he expected a majority. In the meantime, he is provisioning the Antilles, exciting the Canadians,⁵ arming the Kentuckians and preparing an expedition by sea to second their descent upon New Orleans. The week before this letter, he had received a memorial from DePauw, a Kentucky merchant,⁶ familiar by his trading voyages down the Mississippi with the forts held by Spain on the route, and who had just come from New Orleans. DePauw related in a paper written about 1808 that on the twentieth of April, 1793, he had taken part in a French dinner party in New Orleans, at which plans for a descent on New Orleans from Kentucky were concocted.⁷

ning with St. Louis, and with further aid he could take Pensacola and, if Santa Fé and the rest of New Mexico were desired, he knew their avenues; and all of Spanish America with its mines would follow. He planned to expatriate himself: "My country has proved notoriously ungrateful for my services and so forgetful of those successful and almost unexampled enterprizes which gave it the whole of its territory on this side of the great mountains, as in this, my very prime of life, to have neglected me." Compare also the unsigned memoir in *Report of the American Historical Association*, 1896, p. 972.

¹ *Proceedings of American Philosophical Society*, 1889, Michaux's Journal, with biographical introduction, and bibliographical references.

² Compare Jefferson to George Rogers Clark, December 4, 1783 (52 Clark MSS., 93, printed on p. 673, post,) proposing the exploration to him, and see Turner, *Indian Trade in Wisconsin*, in *Johns Hopkins University Studies*, IX., pp. 18 ff.

³ *Report of American Historical Association*, 1896, pp. 982, 983.

⁴ Archives, États-Unis, Vol. 37, fo. 431.

⁵ On the French intrigues in Canada see *Report on Canadian Archives*, 1891, 1894, and Dorchester's proclamation of November 26, 1793, in *Philadelphia Gazette*, March 6, 1794.

⁶ *Report of American Historical Association*, 1896, pp. 977, 1002 and 1102. Charles De Pauw is said (*Representative Men of Indiana*) to have come out with LaFayette. His grandson was the benefactor of DePauw University.

⁷ He says that Colonel John "Blane" of Lincoln and John Speed of Bullet County, Kentucky, were present. *Report of American Historical Association*, 1896, p. 1103.

The correspondence of Governor Carondelet, of New Orleans, with his government¹ shows that French intrigues were then in progress in that city, and that he had reason to fear an insurrection. Indeed, in the July following, Carondelet reported the expulsion of sixty-eight French suspects from New Orleans, and he was inquiring into mysterious gatherings, outside the city.² He wrote: "It is whispered by some that in a few months the French will be here. For my part I can affirm that if (which may God forbid) the arms of Spain and of her allies were to suffer any drawback, or if some four frigates were to present themselves here with 1200 French troops there would arise a faction in this city in favor of the Convention which would cause great havoc and perhaps the loss of the province. My small garrison and the faithful vassals of the king are resolved to achieve impossibilities and to die arms in hand; but unless the 300 men lacking to this regiment are sent from Spain by the end of the year we shall lose even this honorable consolation, since for the protection of the most necessary posts and for avoiding a surprise, the men remaining are hardly sufficient, . . . while those previously received are of such a bad character that the prisons are continually filled and but for the adoption of extreme penalties against the delinquents in these circumstances, two-thirds of the regiment would be in prison, and we should remain without any troops. To these important reasons must be added the fears inspired in us by the very disquieting movements of the Americans settled in the West, against whom I cannot oppose sufficient forces in case of any hostility from them."³ He states further that owing to the withdrawal of the troops that had come from Havana, the New Orleans garrison scarcely amounted to 700 men, and 920 were employed in twenty-one detachments distributed over more than 600 leagues.

This apprehension of the governor of Louisiana and West Florida was amply confirmed by the statements of De Pauw and other informants in regard to the weakness of the Spanish posts and the ease of taking them.⁴ Most of the plans against New Orleans proposed to leave St. Louis unassailed, to be taken after the lower river was secured. Below the confluence of the Ohio with the Mississippi

¹ *Id.*, 974.

² Draper Collection, 42 Clark MSS., 1.

³ Carondelet to Alcudia, July 3, 1793. *Report of American Historical Association*, 1896, p. 996.

⁴ See *American Historical Review*, III. 497; and *Report of American Historical Association*, 1896, p. 972. Carondelet's description of his posts and preparations for defence in 1793 and 1794 is in *American Historical Review*, II. 475. General Collot in the service of France visited these posts in 1796, and his description of them, with an excellent atlas, giving plans of each, is in his *Journey in North America*.

the first post was that of New Madrid, or L'Anse à la Graise, where a captain and twenty to forty men with ten cannon were reported. The fort, it was thought, could easily be taken, or passed in the night. Chickasaw Bluff, or Écores à Margot, was as yet unoccupied by a fort, but the Spaniards suspected the Americans of the design of securing that point. Walnut Hills, or Nogales (now Vicksburg), the site of O'Fallon's projected Yazoo colony, was begun in 1790 to resist that project. It was believed to be commanded by neighboring hills, however, and since its garrison of about 100 men were chiefly Frenchmen, its numerous artillery was less to be feared. Below Walnut Hills, as Carondelet admitted, there was nothing to prevent the enemy from reaching the capital. The French settlers were ripe for revolt, and Natches, dominated on all sides, and with American settlers about it, would fall an easy prey. The forts of Manchac and Baton Rouge were in ruins. New Orleans was expected to revolt against the Spanish rule; and a French fleet blockading the mouth of the river would co-operate with the frontiersmen. Such in outline were the plans proposed for the Kentucky side of the expedition. Mangourit was himself engaged in preparing for a descent on St. Augustine from South Carolina and Georgia, with a fleet and 1500 frontiersmen, while another expedition of 2000 backwoodsmen from the southern up-country was to descend the Tennessee to unite its forces with George Rogers Clark.

After his interviews with Michaux, Brown and DePauw, the matter was sufficiently advanced for Genet to sound Jefferson; for if the Secretary of State and leader of the Democratic party could be actively enlisted in the design, its success seemed certain. From what has already been said, it is clear that as early as February, 1793, Jefferson understood that it was the intention of France to free Louisiana. He was opposed to the form at least of the proclamation of neutrality, and he expected war with Spain. On the fifth of July Genet unfolded to him, "not as Secretary of State, but as Mr. Jefferson," the outline of his Kentucky project,¹ as embodied in his instructions to Michaux. He also read his proposed address to the Canadians. Jefferson's minute of the conversation indicates that he understood that the expedition was to rendezvous out of the territories of the United States (he supposed in Louisiana), and that Louisiana was to be established as an independent state connected in commerce with France and the United States. "I told him," said Jefferson, "that his enticing officers and souldiers from Kentucky to go against Spain, was really putting a halter about their

¹ *Report of American Historical Association*, 1896, p. 948; Jefferson, *Writings*, I. 235.

necks, for that they would assuredly be hung if they commenced hostilities against a nation at peace with the United States. That leaving out that article I did not care what insurrections might be excited in Louisiana." Jefferson adds that he gave Michaux a letter of introduction to Governor Shelby of Kentucky, changing the original draft at the desire of Genet, so that it introduced him not only as a man of science, but also as having the good opinion of Genet, and commended him to the notice, councils and good offices of Shelby. "His character here persuades me," wrote the Secretary, "that they will be worthily bestowed on him, and that your further knowledge of him will justify the liberty I take of making him known to you." This letter, innocent enough in appearance, was, doubtless by design, left with the date of June 28, ante-dating the second conversation with Genet. It is further elucidated by the letter of this minister to his government, on the twenty-fifth of July. "Mr. Jefferson," he declares, "seemed to me to be quickly sensible of the utility of the project, but he told me that the United States had begun negotiations with Spain on the subject of the demand that the Americans be given an entrepôt below New Orleans and while this negotiation was not broken off, the delicacy of the United States did not permit them to take part in our operations; nevertheless he made me understand that he thought that a little spontaneous irruption in New Orleans could advance the matter, and he put me into connection with several deputies of Kentucky and notably with Mr. Brown."¹

Jefferson's attitude toward the French design is interesting, since his own presidency was rendered illustrious by the acquisition of Louisiana for the United States. "There is on the globe one single spot," he wrote in 1802, "the possessor of which is our natural and habitual enemy. It is New Orleans. The day that France takes possession of New Orleans fixes the sentence which is to restrain her within her low water mark. . . . From that day we must marry ourselves to the British fleet and nation."²

But Jefferson's position in 1793 is less easy to explain, partly because it is doubtful how far he understood the ulterior designs of France to hold Louisiana and detach the West; partly because the policy of aggressive territorial acquisition by that power was the work of the succeeding years, and Jefferson's own nationalism was to a considerable degree the work of his presidency; and partly also, because his views of Genet's personality changed rapidly.

¹ Genet then recounts the assistance given him by the latter in advice and influence. *Report of American Historical Association*, 1896, p. 982, n. 2.

² Jefferson to Living ton, April 18, 1802.

Genet himself wrote in the succeeding autumn¹ that, in the beginning, Jefferson seemed disposed to second his views, and gave him useful ideas of the men in position; nevertheless, he says that he noted in his official declarations a sort of reserve which convinced him that Jefferson was aiming to keep in place whatever happened, and he finally found himself deserted by him. Jefferson on the other hand came to know that Genet's desire was to force the Americans into war on the side of France, contrary to his professions, and that he did not promise everything and ask nothing, as he had at first supposed. The truth seems to be that, in the beginning, Jefferson believed that motives of policy coincided with his friendliness for France, and that in the probable event of war against Spain the freedom of Louisiana by French assistance was not to be rejected. He was not yet dispossessed of his illusions with respect to French disinterestedness. By a protest against the use of Kentucky to violate our neutrality, he saved his official conscience, at least; but he did not break with Genet. He wrote the letter of introduction for Michaux,² and he was left in a position to "watch events." Genet's actions, however, soon compelled Jefferson to abandon him. Even before this interview, Jefferson wrote Monroe that he did not augur well of the mode of conduct of the new French minister, and he was aiming to disabuse him of the idea that he had an appeal from President and Congress to the people. The affair of the *Little Democrat* immediately after the interview led Jefferson to declare: "his conduct is indefensible by the most furious Jacobin. I only wish our countrymen may distinguish between him and his nation."³ And indeed the Jacobinical forces themselves, which had come into power in France in June, did not desire to defend him. Soon Deforgues' letter⁴ was on its way, in which the new Minister of Foreign Relations, foreseeing the tendency of his course, pointed out in severe terms that he was instructed "to treat with the *government* and not with a *portion of the people*," and not to exercise *pro-consular* powers in a *friendly* nation. Referring to the criticisms on Washington in Genet's dispatches, he says: "Deceived by a false popularity you have alienated from yourself the only man who could be for us the

¹ Genet to Minister, October 7, 1793, Archives, États-Unis, Vol. 38, fo. 402.

² Later he seemed desirous to conceal the significance of this letter. See *Report of American Historical Association*, 1896, p. 933.

³ Jefferson, *Works*, IV. 19. Genet wrote on the twelfth of August that he would publish his correspondence with Jefferson, "a man endowed with good qualities but weak enough to sign what he does not think and defend officially measures which he condemns in conversation and anonymous writings." Archives, États-Unis, Vol. 38, fo. 182; De Witt, *Jefferson*, 530.

⁴ July 30, 1793, Archives, États-Unis, Vol. 38, fo. 107; De Witt, *Jefferson*, 525.

organ of the American people." He sneers at Genet's professions of having already armed the Kentuckians and Canadians and awaits the developments of these measures, but observes that an expedition by sea prepared at Philadelphia against New Orleans would openly violate American neutrality and render Genet odious to the government; and finally he charges him to gain the confidence of the President and Congress. Genet, in the thick of party contests, took little heed of the warning, and rushed boldly on to meet his fate by the appeal to the people against Washington.

It is not the purpose of the present paper to relate the progress of the preparations for the expedition that followed.¹ The downfall of the Girondins led naturally to the disavowal and recall of Genet. Soon after arriving, Fauchet, his successor, issued a proclamation (March 6, 1794) terminating the expedition. It came when Clark and his friends were actively preparing for the descent of the Mississippi, and when troops were already gathered at the St. Mary's and along the frontier of Georgia for an attack on St. Augustine. Had the proclamation been delayed, the attempt would certainly have been begun. What the result of such an attempt would have been, with the Spaniards fully informed, the military forces of the United States under orders to oppose it, and the leading friends of Genet already alienated, need not be considered here.

The very extensiveness of the original project, the succession of unforeseen changes in the government and the military situation of France, but above all the character of Genet and of Washington worked to render it abortive. Enough has been said to reveal the fact that this attempt was an important chapter in the history of the Mississippi Valley in its relations to the future of the United States, of France and of Spain. It is, in fact, a chapter in the long struggle of the people of that Valley to hold the approaches to their great river—a struggle that is not yet ended.

FREDERICK J. TURNER.

¹ See *American Historical Review*, III. 490; *Report of American Historical Association*, 1896, p. 930, and the documents to be published in the same *Report* for 1897, on the expedition in the Carolinas and Georgia.

DOCUMENTS

1. Jefferson to George Rogers Clark, 1783.

THE following letter of Thomas Jefferson to George Rogers Clark of Kentucky, the well-known conqueror of the Illinois country in the Revolution, is from the Draper Collection of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 52 Clark MSS., 93. I am indebted to Secretary Reuben G. Thwaites for permission to use it. The significance of the letter becomes increased when it is recalled that William, the brother of George Rogers Clark, was the famous companion of Lewis in the Lewis and Clark expedition of 1804-1806.

The publication in 1783 of Ledyard's account of Captain Cook's voyage, which aroused interest in Pacific trade, and the organization of the British Northwest Company in that year, may have influenced Jefferson in addressing George Rogers Clark. At Paris, in 1786, Jefferson was interested in Ledyard's scheme for engaging a wealthy French mercantile company, the house of Le Coulteux, in the fur-trade of the Pacific coast, and he secured from this house a promise that they would consider the advantages of Alexandria, on the Potomac, for their depot of supply.¹ Jefferson's interest in canals connecting the Potomac and the Ohio was partly due to this project. After the failure of Ledyard's Parisian plans, Jefferson proposed to him to cross Russia to Kamchatka, take ship to Nootka Sound, and thence return to the United States by way of the Missouri.² But this failed through Russian opposition.

In 1792 Jefferson proposed to the American Philosophical Society to send an explorer by way of the Missouri to the Pacific. He selected Lewis as leader, with André Michaux (the botanist whose connections with George Rogers Clark and Genet are noted in the article on Genet in this number of the REVIEW), as his companion. Jefferson made out instructions for Michaux in January, 1793. But the plans of Genet prevented this project; and the fears of Jefferson lest England gain priority in this trans-continental ex-

¹Jefferson, *Writings*, IV. 326 *et passim*.

²Jefferson, *Memoir of Meriwether Lewis*, in Coues, *History of the Lewis and Clark Expedition*, I. xviii.

pedition were partly verified when Alexander Mackenzie crossed through Canada in 1793 to the Pacific.¹ In the fall of 1794 Carondelet, governor of Louisiana, relates that he has offered a reward to a St. Louis company of explorers, if they should reach the Pacific and bring back news of the Russian settlements.²

The outcome of these various attempts of Jefferson in the Lewis and Clark expedition is well known. William Clark gave to George Rogers Clark an early account of his success.

FREDERICK J. TURNER.

Annapolis Dec. 4. 1783.

Dear Sir

I received here about a week ago your obliging letter of Oct. 12. 1783. with the shells and seeds for which I return you many thanks. you are also so kind as to keep alive the hope of getting for me as many of the different species of bones, teeth and tusks of the Mammoth as can now be found. this will be most acceptable, Pittsburg and Philadelphia or Winchester will be the surest channel of conveyance. I find they have subscribed a very large sum of money in England for exploring the country from the Missisipi to California. they pretend it is only to promote knolege. I am afraid they have thoughts of colonising into that quarter. some of us have been talking here in a feeble way of making the attempt to search that country. but I doubt whether we have enough of that kind of spirit to raise the money. how would you like to lead such a party? tho I am afraid our prospect is not worth asking the question. the definitive treaty of peace is at length arrived. it is not altered from the preliminaries. the cession of the territory West of Ohio to the United states has been at length accepted by Congress, with some small alterations of the conditions. we are in daily expectation of receiving it with the final approbation of Virginia. Congress have been lately agitated by questions where they should fix their residence. they first resolved on Trentown. the Southern states however contrived to get a vote that they would give half their time to Georgetown at the Falls of Patowmac. still we consider the matter as undecided between the Delaware and Patowmac. we urge the latter as the only point of union which can cement us to our Western friends when they shall be formed into separate states. I shall always be happy to hear from you and am with very particular esteem, D^r. Sir

Your friend and humble servt

TH. JEFFERSON

[Addressed : Gen^l. George Rogers Clarke.]

¹ Mackenzie, *Voyages through America*.

² AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW, II. 476.

2. *Diary and Letters of Henry Ingersoll, Prisoner at Carthagena, 1806-1809.*

Among the foreigners who came to the United States at or soon after the close of their struggle for independence was Francisco Miranda, born under Spanish rule in Caracas, South America. He conceived the idea of a similar independence for his own country and solicited aid for that purpose from the United States, from England, Austria, Russia, and France, but without avail, since none wished to become involved in a war with Spain. He took an active military part in the French Revolution but was compelled to flee to England and later returned to the United States. The close connection of France and Spain after the treaty of Basel (1795) brought the Federalist leaders to his aid in this country in view of the prospective war with France. Hamilton was desirous of commanding an expedition to Spanish South America in co-operation with England; but President Adams, however strong his feeling against France, looked coldly on such leadership and gave Miranda little encouragement save in polite words. The defeat of the Federalists in 1800 deprived Miranda of their aid. Finding the Jeffersonian party not predisposed to aid him, he resolved to head an expedition on his own responsibility. Securing financial aid from two citizens of New York, Col. W. S. Smith and Mr. Samuel G. Ogden, Miranda fitted out the small ship *Leander* in 1806, and embarked men under various pretences. Sailing to the West Indies, he engaged two small schooners, upon which he placed some of his men. As the expedition approached the South American coast near Caracas, the little fleet was engaged by two Spanish vessels, during which the *Leander* fled, leaving the two pilot schooners and some sixty men in the hands of the enemy. Among the prisoners was Henry Ingersoll, whose diary and letters are printed here for the first time. Miranda eventually landed and had some success; but during the course of his second and more famous expedition of 1810 he was captured, and died in chains in a Cadiz prison in 1816.

Henry Ingersoll was a native of Massachusetts and had been apprenticed to the printer's trade. For his skill in this craft, although a mere lad, he was engaged by Miranda, who carried with him a printing press for the various manifestos to be issued to his fellow-countrymen after he had landed. In a narrative written soon after his release from captivity, Ingersoll describes the artifices resorted to by Miranda's agents in enlisting men:

"A principal object with Miranda was how to obtain the proper persons to accompany him; it was no hard matter to procure sailors sufficient as the Ship *Leander* had long been a St. Domingo Trader, there-

fore her present appearance excited no suspicion ; but it was not so easy to engage any to enlist as Soldiers. Great circumspection was necessary not only to prevent public alarm, but to allay any suspicion which might arise in the breasts of those who were engaged. In this transaction I cannot but admire the cunning and skill of Miranda or his agents, as well as reprobate the falshood and duplicity resorted to. Mr. John Fink was applied to by Col. Smith to engage about 30 young butchers out of the New York markets to enlist as Soldiers to go to New Orleans to serve as guards to the United States Mail. They were stout, smart athletic young men, totally ignorant of public affairs ; without the least idea of any deception being used. Miranda's object no doubt was to attach these men to his person. A number of Mechanics were engaged by different men under various auspices. Miles L. Hall was authorized by Col. Smith to engage a certain number of printers for stipulated wages. Several young gentlemen engaged as officers. . . .

"In this manner did Col. Smith engage nearly one hundred men besides those belonging to the ship, a great part of whom were intended as officers. . . .

"In the mean time every precaution was taken by Lewis and others to convey on board the *Leander* her military stores, &c., to elude the vigilance of the public eye. After the principal part of the cargo was on board she unmoored from alongside the wharf and dropped down to Staten Island, where she was made ready to receive Miranda and his officers. The following are some of the *iotas* of which the cargo was composed. About 5000 pikes, 300 pairs of pistols, 50 rifles, 1500 muskets, about 2000 swords and cutlasses, 40 cannon, 2 brass pieces, 20 tons of cannon balls, half a ton of musket-balls, 150 quarter casks powder, 2 doz. saddles and bridles, 700 suits clothes consisting of jackets and trousers and a few military suits."

From the correspondence of Miranda with President Jefferson and Secretary Madison, some of the men embarked in the enterprise supposed that the government was at least cognizant of the plan.

"In the official language held by the president in his communication to Congress in year 1805 a Spanish war was tho't unavoidable ; and if I am correct the Marquis de Yrujo was ordered to leave Washington during the winter of 1806. These events determined some to engage in this Expedition, under the idea that it was under the implied sanction of government. I do not say it was so, I know the insufficiency of the data which I go upon ; but it was a natural conclusion." "I do not intend to accuse the administration of my country ; but I wish to exculpate those who entered into this expedition from the charge of piracy ; and too that they had forfeited all claim to protection from their own government and even lost the right of citizenship."

The prisoner frequently asserts that President Jefferson was privy to the expedition. In 1809, after his retirement from the presidency,

Jefferson wrote to Don Valentine de Foronda, at that time Spanish minister to the United States :

" Your predecessor, soured on a question of etiquette against the administration of this country, wished to impute wrong to them in all their actions, even where he did not believe it himself. In this spirit, he wished it to be believed that we were in unjustifiable co-operation in Miranda's expedition. I solemnly, and on my personal truth and honor, declare to you, that this was entirely without foundation, and that there was neither co-operation nor connivance on our part. He informed us he was about to attempt the liberation of his native country from bondage, and intimated a hope of our aid, or connivance at least. He was at once informed that although we had great cause of complaint against Spain, and even of war, yet whenever we should think proper to act as her enemy, it should be openly and above board, and that our hostility should never be exercised by such petty means. We had no suspicion that he expected to engage men here, but merely to purchase military stores. Against this there was no law, nor consequently any authority for us to interpose obstacles. On the other hand, we deemed it improper to betray his voluntary communication to the agents of Spain. Although his measures were many days in preparation at New York, we never had the least intimation or suspicion of his engaging men in his enterprise, until he was gone ; and I presume the secrecy of his proceeding kept them equally unknown to the Marquis Yrujo at Philadelphia and the Spanish consul at New York, since neither of them gave us any information of the enlistment of men, until it was too late for any measures taken at Washington to prevent their departure. The officer in the Customs, who participated in this transaction with Miranda, we immediately removed, and should have had him and others further punished, had it not been for the protection given them by private citizens at New York, in opposition to the government, who by their impudent falsehoods and calumnies were able to overbear the minds of the jurors."¹

A petition from the prisoners at Carthagená was presented² to the second session of the Tenth Congress, asserting that they had been " entrapped into the service of the said Miranda on the expedition by assurances made at the time of their engagements, that they were to be employed in the service of the United States and under the authority of the government." No opportunity of escape had been possible save at Jacmel and there they had been strictly guarded.

The committee to whom this petition was referred made a rather colorless report, presuming that the prisoners had told the truth and that the execution of the officers by the Spanish government

¹ *Works*, V. 474.

² *Annals of Congress*, Tenth Congress, 2d Session, pp. 488-491, 511, 896-898 ; petition of September 16, 1808 ; *American State Papers*, Foreign Relations, III. 256, 257.

further showed these survivors to be secondary offenders. The "dictates of humanity" also pleaded for their succor; but the recommendation that the President be requested to take immediate steps for their release was lost, 50 to 34, the Republican majority from the middle and southern states against the minority from Federalist New England and from New York.

In the first session of the next Congress, a new report¹ was made on the prisoners' petition. "They were, by various misrepresentations and deceptions, incautiously drawn into the service of General Miranda in an expedition, *hostile in its intention*, against some of the Spanish settlements in South America; that they were engaged under various pretences of serving their country and acting in conformity to its laws—some *ostensibly* were to go to New Orleans and act as guards to the United States mail, others were to follow their different mechanical professions in that country and the residue were engaged for a direct voyage to St. Domingo and back to New York."

An extended debate on the recommendation of the committee for relief at the hands of President Jefferson at once drifted into the question of the knowledge possessed by the government of the expedition before it sailed. Quotations were made from the evidence produced at the trial of Col. Smith and Mr. Ogden,² indicted in New York for promoting the expedition, to prove the connivance of the government. The Republicans opposed the report mainly on the ground that the prisoners had by their own action voluntarily expatriated themselves and removed all claim for assistance on the part of the United States. They further argued that such relief might lead to serious complications with Spain. Since Miranda had fled to England, the expedition was branded as a British scheme from the beginning, directed against her enemy, Spain. Among those who pleaded for the prisoners was Bacon, of Massachusetts, who refuted the insinuation that they were habitual criminals and outlaws by claiming acquaintance with one of them (Ingersoll) from his own town (Stockbridge), "of a reputable family."

Public sentiment in favor of the men had made headway since the first petition and it now required the casting vote of the speaker to defeat the report and destroy the hope of the government's aiding the captives.

Although the aid of the government was thus lost in high party feelings, the debate at one time having almost precipitated a duel, yet there were not wanting many schemes of relief at the hands of

¹ *Annals of Congress*, Eleventh Congress, 1st Session, pp. 161, 257, 269-315; *American State Papers*, Foreign Relations, III. 258, 259.

² *The Trials of William S. Smith and Samuel G. Ogden*, New York, 1807.

private persons and parties. The letter to Mr. Bacon, representative from Massachusetts, which was afterwards secured by Mr. Ingersoll, will illustrate one of many fruitless plans.

It is a fresh illustration of the weakness of the United States during this period that the liberation of Mr. Ingersoll was secured entirely through British intercession. Hon. Theodore Sedgwick, a resident of Stockbridge, Massachusetts, to whom one of the appeals of the prisoner had been sent, asked the influence of Erskine, the British Minister to the United States, in behalf of the boy. He in turn begged Hammond, former minister to this country, to present the case of Ingersoll, "a youth of little experience," to the Spanish Minister at St. James, Admiral Apodaca. The Admiral assured Hammond that he would "not fail to use his good Offices with his Government in behalf of the young Man in the first Dispatch he may have an opportunity of sending to Spain." Four months later Hammond received a triplicate of a letter "from the Supreme Government of Spain to the Government at Santa Fe [Bogotá], directing Mr. Ingersoll's immediate Release."¹

The pardon recites that "some persons belonging to the royal family and some belonging to the ministry of His Britannic Majesty having strongly recommended a petition presented by the Minister at the court of London, soliciting the liberty of John Edward Moore, English subject, and Henry Ingersoll, citizen of the United States, two young men who by reason of their trust in others, want of experience, and youth were seduced and deceived by Miranda and have been taken in this kingdom and condemned to ten years of confinement in the Castle of Omoa in the kingdom of Guatemala, the Supreme Central and Governing Junta of the Kingdoms of Spain and the Indies, being well informed and considering the distinguished recommendations of the persons who concern themselves in behalf of these unfortunates, moreover considering their youth and want of experience, has caused them to be freed from all punishment," etc.

At proper places in the Diary, selections are inserted in brackets from an uncompleted sketch of his adventures by Mr. Ingersoll. His letters are also inserted in chronological order. Editorial corrections and additions are indicated by brackets and italics. For the opportunity to print these papers the REVIEW is indebted to Mrs. M. E. Bell, of Bay City, Michigan, granddaughter of Henry Ingersoll.

EDWIN ERLE SPARKS.²

¹ Letters of Erskine, October 30, 1808, and April 14, 1809, enclosing copies of Hammond's of February 9 and April 6, 1809, and of Apodaca's of January 7, 1809.

² The footnotes are partly by Professor Sparks, partly by the managing editor.

A few remarkable events that happen^d on board the Ship Leander of sixteen guns Cap^t Tho^s Lewis, owned by Sam^l G. Ogden of New York, bound from N. Y to the Island of St Domingo in the West Indias. they are as follows—¹

- 1806 Sailed from New York, a number of passengers on board,
Feb. 2 Cargo unknown. [High were the expectations of many as to their future destinies.]
Feb. 10 Saw the Island of Barmuda
12 The Cleopatra Frigate, Cap^t White, board^d us, exchanged some Americans for some Englishmen we had on board, after detaining us a bout 36 hours suffered us to pass
14 Brought to a small Spanish schooner bound to the Island of Puerto Rico, let her pass. [Conjectures as to Miranda's object in bringing her too—his right questioned.]
18 Came to in the harbor of Jacquemel in the Island of St. Domingo, during our stay in Jacquemel the Cap^t of the Leander chartered two schooners, the Bee Cap^t Rob^t Huddle, on board of which, Lewis sent 33 men all armed, with a nine pounder, under the command of Dan^l D. Durning, and the schooner Bacchus Cap^t James Gardiner unarmed. [Misfortunes—quarrel of Capt. Lewis and Miranda—Lewis' journey to Port-au Prince—the result— . . . addition to our force &c.]

I. H. INGERSOLL TO HIS PARENTS.

Jacquemel, (Island of St. Domingo)

On board the Leander, March 22nd 1806

Dear Father and Mother,

Knowing that any information concerning me will be recived with pleasure I think it my duty to embrace every opportunity of writing you.—Sunday 2nd of February I sailed in the Ship Leander, on the secret expedition I mentioned in my last. In four days we passed to the leeward of Bermuda. Wednesday Feb^y 12th in lat. 24.40. N. descried a sail off our lee-bow at 8 o'clock A.M.—at 12 bore down upon us: Expecting her to be a French privateer, we hove too, and made every preparation for action, every person on board took his station. we were determined not to be taken. I expected to have seen a warm engagement; at 2 P. M she came up with us, hoisted English colours she proved to be the Cleopatra of 44 guns; after detaining us 24 hours and impressing 20 seamen for whom she gave us in exchange 12 Americans she suffered us to proceed; the Seamen she took from us were all English subjects; from our suspicious appearance she had good reason for detaining us till she was satisfied we had not contraband articles

¹For the events to the end of 1807 the reader may compare *A General Account of Miranda's Expedition*, New York, 1808, by John H. Sherman; for those to the end of April, 1806, *The History of Don Francisco de Miranda's Attempt to effect a Revolution in South America*, by James Biggs, London, 1809, pp. 1-82, both published anonymously.

aboard:—Sunday 16th bro't too a Spanish schooner, after exam[in]ing her papers let her pass; 18th becalmed in sight of Jacquemel. this day a Sailor fell over-board, and was with difficulty saved. Capt. Lewis went by land to Port-au Prince and engaged the Ship Emperor for the expedition. Wednesday 19th came to anchor in the harbor of Jacquemel. Thursday put up a printing press on board the Ship. Friday Saturday and Sunday printed 2,000 Proclamations in the Spanish language,¹ declaratory of our intentions, which as soon as we arrive at our destination will be distributed to all parts of the world. Thursday 6th of March my birthday I went ashore at Jacquemel for the first time since I left N. York. It will be expected I should give a description of Jacquemel, the manners, customs, &c. the short time I was ashore, and the little opportunity I had of improving it, together with my not being acquainted with their language, are obstacles not easily surmounted. As to the productions I imagine they are the same with the rest of the island, and other parts of the West Indies. there appears to be plenty of coffee, I saw Oranges, Cotton Tamarinds &c. in full bloom. I should judge there were about 500 houses the greater of them no more than miserable huts; the inhabitants are chiefly blacks I observed no business going on except a few taylors at work, and the women washing in the River. they live chiefly on yams and bananos; I had not an opportunity of going into the country to see their plantations: I think when a peace takes place between France and England, the French will finally subdue the blacks. they will take the Sea-port towns; the blacks will then retire to the mountains, but in time they must surrender. Jacquemel lies on the South side of the island opposite Port-au-Prince. You will naturally ask where I am going, and what I intend to do; It is not proper yet to entrust it in a letter but it will soon be made known to the world; indeed I am not fully in the secret; but I have that confidence in the faith and honor of those concerned if we should succeed I shall be able to return to America in a less degree of dependence than when I left it.

We had a very good passage from N. York to Jacquemel in 17 days: I was sick almost all the passage but at present I enjoy very good health: I think a warm climate will agree with me. the ship Sampson Capt T. Edwards sailed from the Hook the same day we did, bound to the E. Indies, we soon parted with her. Give my love to J. Sergeant, if he is still alive. I left two of my profiles framed with Mr. Stevens N. Y. one of them I intended for Sally. My love to her, and all the rest of my brothers and sisters, no more at present,

adieu, your affectionate Son,

HENRY INGERSOLL.

Mr. Jonathan Ingersoll.

P. S. My compliments to J. Hunt. I shall write him the next opportunity. My respects to Doct. Jones and family.

[Addressed: "Mr. Jonathan Ingersoll, Stockbridge, County of Berkshire, Massachusetts, America."]

¹ Sherman, 35-39, gives the text of one.

1806

- March 27 Left Jacquemel destination unknown [Bee ran foul the Leander and lost her flying jib-boom]
- 28 I with Twenty men more, all arm^d was sent on board the Bacchus.
- April 8 Owing to bad Seamanship, or some intention of Cap^t Lewis we ran into the Bay of Venezuela on the Coast of Terra Firma
- 14 Came to Anchor in the Island of Aruba [*Oruba*], where we found two English armed Vessels a Brig and a Schooner Com^d by Cap^t Philips, while at aruba General Miranda had his troops amounting in all to about 200 men armed and accoutred in the best manner that circumstances would admit, charter^d the schooner Echo of 4 guns and 25 men Com^d by Cap^t Philips, every thing was put into the greatest order, Capt. Gardiner took the Com^d of the Infantry and John O'Sullivan 2nd Mate of the Leander took the Com^d of the Schooner Bacchus [While at Aruba Miranda's troops amounting in all to about 200 men paraded ashore armed and accoutred in the best manner they were able under the direction of Col. George W. Kirkland]
- 20 Saw the Island of Curacao, in the night of the Same Ins^t the schooner Echo Cap^t Philips ran away. [in attempting to beat to windward the schooner Echo left us.]
- 24 The schooner Bacchus Cap^t O Sullivan came to an anchor in the Island of Bonaire [*Buen Aire*], the same day Joined Convoy and proceeded to the Coast of Terra Firma
- 28 Fell in with two Armed Spanish vessels a Brig of 22 Guns and a Schooner of 18 Guns, after some macunuevers and a few shots from boath sides, (in which Cap^t R. Huddle was Kill^d by a grape shot) the Ship Leander ran a way leaving us to the mercy of our enemies. we were taken prisoners tied and carried into Puerto Cavallo [*Porto Cabello*], on boarding the Schooner Bee one man named Joseph Paulding of the City of Philadelphia, was thrown overboard and was drown^d. the same night we were cram^d into a small dungeon shackeled two and two. [In sight of the main descryed 2 vessels to leeward. ran down towards them. they crowded sail and ran from us. events have proved they went into the harbor obtained a supply of men that night and came out immediately to watch our movements, for on the next morning the brig of 22 guns was within gun-shot. the schooner mounted 18 guns. after some manoevering an action commenced, but the redoubtable Miranda, and the Almighty Lewis,¹ fled leaving two pilot-boat schooners containing 60 men to sustain the action or give

¹ An allusion to Capt. Lewis's angry declaration, on an earlier occasion, that he "was the Almighty on board his own ship."

- 1806 themselves up to the mercy of their enemies.¹ . . . the enemy after securing their prizes proceeded with them into Porto Cavallo. . . . On coming to anchor about 12 o'clock at night under the guns of the Castle of St. Philip, information by signal having been previously communicated to the forts and country adjacent of their success, they were ready to receive us. the military were all ordered out. curiosity, consternation, or some other object, had drawn together crowds of people to behold the wretched victims of Miranda's mad ambition.]
- May 3 Cap' D. D. Durning owing to the small Close and Filthy Dungeon he was in was [literally smothered to death].
- 12 Arrived the Lieutenant Governor and commissioners from Caracas to take our declarations. [which was to be the only form of trial we were to have for our lives.]
- June 2 Our declarations closed and sent on to Caracas for trial. [During the interim it is impossible to conceive the wretched state of mind the prisoners were in. their anxiety was indescribable. the state of suspense and uncertainty was worse than death itself.]
- July 20 Our sentences arrived and the result was made known to us in the following manner the doors of our Cells were thrown open and we were instantly surrounded by soldiers with Charged Bayonets, in that position we were marched into a small yard that was in the Castle of St Philip, we were instantly ordered to kneel down and the Interpreter read as follo[ws:] that the 10 following were to be hanged and beheaded on the next day—

Tho' Dunahue	George Ferguson
James B Gardiner	John Ferris
Tho' Billop	Paul Theadore George
Miles L Hall	Gustavus Adolphus Burgood
Charles Johnson	Daniel Kemper

Nineteen sentenced for Eight years to the Castle of Boca Chica Fifteen sentenced for Ten years to the Castle of Omoa and Thirteen sentenced for Ten years to the Castle of Puerto Rico [About 8 o'clock in the morning the doors of our Cells were thrown open almost instantaneously without our having the least suspicion of such an event; which presented to our view an unusual number of soldiers, who the moment the door was opened cocked their pieces, charged bayonets with the muzzle of their muskets pointing directly into the prison not more than a few feet from the prison door, in the form of a semi-circle. it may naturally be sup-

¹ Biggs, pp. 77-80, gives an explanation of this affair, but Ingersoll in an unprinted portion of his narrative scouts it. See Sherman, pp. 48-53.

1806

posed this movement excited some surprise ; the first impression every one received was that we were to be butchered on the spot ; I expected every moment their muskets would be discharged upon us and what remained alive would then be bayoneted. . . . at that moment my Country, my friends, and everything I held dear rushed in upon my mind like a torrent and almost overwhelmed me ; yet at this awful moment every man manifested a degree of firmness that astonished even our enemies and rendered a precaution of theirs unnecessary ; in ordering some slaves to be ready with a sort of bench to carry those to the place of sentence who should be unable to proceed. . . . The following persons were sentenced to be hung and beheaded and their heads placed on poles to be put up at different places within the province. . . . After the sentence was read we were remanded back into Prison in the same order except those unfortunate ten who were to be executed were taken to a separate prison]

21

The sentence was put into execution in the following manner we were taken out and tied half naked and in double Irons to one another marched to the Gallows, where we beheld our companions hanged and beheaded.

August 7

We were put on board the arm^d Ship Prince of Peace in double Irons [to be transported to Carthagená about 300 miles from Porto Cavallo. This is a large City on the Spanish Main, the principal depot of prisoners of War. It was supposed we were more secure here than at Porto Cavallo. After undergoing the most rigid inspection of our irons, the greater part of them being newly rivetted the prisoners were all marched out of the Castle at about 4 o'clock P. M. and conveyed on board an armed merchant ship the Prince of Peace Lieut. Don Pedro with about fifty soldiers had the charge of the prisoners exclusive of the ship's crew. They were all placed between decks, and a Centinel stationed at each hatchway, which rendered all hopes of an attempt to rescue ourselves at Sea impracticable, however several schemes were projected but failed ; it is supposed in consequence of their plans being overheard by some of the Crew, who it was afterwards understood could speak some English. The idea which has been suggested in some publication of their being betrayed thro' fear by one of their number is false.¹ On leaving Porto Cavallo, a small pilot-boat schooner accompanied the Ship, sailing to windward and a head to keep a look out for an English squadron which had appeared off the coast the day preceeding ; she left the ship the 2nd day. Events have since confirmed a suspicion that a British squadron was but a few leagues to the leeward at one time. Great was the chance they would be met by an English frigate.]

¹ Probably a reference to Sherman, p. 81.

1806

- August 15 Arrived safe in the City of Carthagena [The prisoners were landed from the ship in two row-boats. The distance from the ship to the shore was about 3 miles. Never did I experience a hotter day, the almost vertical sun was intolerable without hats or clothing sufficient to cover them; their faces and many parts of their bodies were blistered by the scorching rays of the sun. . . . On entering the gates of the city they were met by a motley croud whom curiosity had drawn together to witness the victims of credulity and folly. It was with difficulty the guard could keep the mob at sufficient distance to allow the prisoners to pass. at this time it required all the national pride and fortitude of the prisoners to bear up under the weight of their misfortunes added to the reproaches and insults of the populace. When they arrived at the head of the street where it was intersected by one crossing it which led to the governor's palace they were ordered to halt to give time for a procession to pass composed of the Governor, priests, Officers, and all the grantees of Carthagena that they might have a view of Miranda's followers. Such was the fate allotted to men who had left the peaceful abodes of innocence and ease for fame and greatness. After arriving at the prison they were separated and put in three different apartments, with the admission of but little light, without a free circulation of air, hot, filthy, without any thing to rest their emaciated and almost naked bodies but the moist bricks.]
- Sep^r 1 Those men sentenced for Boca Chica were put to work Chained two and two
a man of the name of Burnside and sentenced to Boca Chica Died.
- 21 John Burk Died in prison
- Oct 21 Eden Burlingham Died [In about a fortnight (they) were all removed to another part of the City. Those persons who were sentenced for eight years hard labor were separated from the rest and placed at work under a slave driver with a strong guard, chained two and two in chains from twelve to fifteen feet in length. . . . In consequence of the death of the above persons, particularly of Burke's dying suddenly in prison, orders were given to their keeper, on the first appearance of sickness among them to remove them immediately to the hospital. This was generally done. about this time Capt. Barker arrived at Carthagena on his way to the U. States, by whom was forwarded a petition to the American government.]¹

¹ Presumably that which is printed in Sherman, pp. 96-98, dated Dec. 30, 1806.

H. H. INGERSOLL TO HIS PARENTS.

Carthagena, Feb' 17, 1807.

Dear Father and Mother,

In my last letter I gave you an account of my unfortunate situation which at present is not changed for the better. I am still a prisoner (or more properly a slave) and in irons at this place; why I am not sent to the place I was sentenced I cannot say. which is to the Castle of Omoa at Vera Cruz. My companions in misfortune who were sentenced to this place are separated from us and are at work here. For the particulars of our capture, trial and condemnation I refer you to my last; provided you have not received that I refer you to the Memorial addressed to the government of the United States¹ by us which goes by the same conveyance with this letter; which I hope will rouse the indignation of the public against those men in the U. S. who have been the principals in the villainous expedition of Miranda, and induce our government to make some effort for our freedom. If the statement which we have sent at different times to America is published I have no doubt but it will have some effect.

Ever since our capture we have had no correct information from America, nor had any opportunity of seeing or speaking with any of our countrymen until the present time. There arrived here a few days since Capt. Barker who has been a prisoner some time among the Spaniards; his ship was taken, himself and all his crew made prisoners on the coast of Chili; he is now on his way to the U. S. where he will make public the manner of his being taken, and the treatment he has since met with: We are under many obligations to Capt B. and his mate, James Bate, for their attention and polite treatment to us while in Carthagena; the depredations [*sic*] of the Spaniards on the American commerce I hope will not remain long unpunished. I allude nothing to our situation for it is of a different nature.

During my imprisonment I have enjoyed good health except a few weeks about last Christmas, when I had an attack of the fever of the Country; I am now in good health. I wrote some time since to my brother, Mr. Allen, which I hope has arrived safe. You must not be surprised if you hear nothing further from me during my imprisonment, as an opportunity of writing may not occur again perhaps the *ten years*. It is galling to my feelings to think of my miserable situation now and contrast it with what it once was; but hope that great cheerer of the human mind bids me look forward to the day when I shall again see both my friends and my country.

My love and affection to all my brothers and sisters, friends and acquaintances, particularly to Dr. Jones and family.

Your Affectionate

H INGERSOLL.

Jonathan Ingersoll,
Stockbridge, Mass.

¹ *American State Papers, Foreign Relations*, III. 257.

1807

April 1 John Scott Died

July 4 Arrived the Ship Four Sisters Capl. Carson from the City of New York with Cloaths and about 200 Dol in Cash for us which was collected by a Committee appointed for our Relief. [Some received more money from their immediate friends which enabled them to effect their escape as will be more particularly related hereafter. This was a seasonable relief. At this time the spirit of the prisoners was at its lowest ebb. Every thing appeared gloomy; no prospect of relief; supposing themselves forgotten, their minds were ready to sink with despair.]

III. H. INGERSOLL TO HIS PARENTS.

Carthagera, August 2, 1807

Dear Parents,

Although fifteen months has elapsed since I was taken prisoner, during which time I have written home several times and not received an answer, still I cannot let pass the present opportunity of again writing. You will perceive by the date of this letter that I am still in Carthagera from whence I wrote you in my last. I expected to be sent to Omoa, the place of my destination the first opportunity; why I am not removed is best known to the Lords of this Country. I am still kept in irons, and in prison, but my situation is in some degree meliorated by the benevolence of the good citizens of the United States. A subscription has been set on foot in the principal cities of the United States for the relief of all the prisoners taken in the two schooners of Miranda. On the 4th of July last arrived here the Ship Four Sisters, Capt. Carson from New York, with cloathing and some money for us, sent by the citizens of New York; the money amounted to upwards of \$4½ a man; there was more than a suite of cloathes a piece, besides a blanket and handkerchief for each one.¹ We cannot feel too grateful to the citizens of New York for those supplies, as it greatly relieved our necessities: We recived at the same time a letter from the Committee, appointed by the citizens of New York for receiving money, for the prisoners and sending it us by proper conveyance and stating that every thing that was possible would be done for us. the following is a short extract from the letter— “*You must not deceive yourselves with the hope of release through any agency of our government they cannot appear in this business— but from the generosity of the Spanish Monarch every thing may be hoped on a representation being properly laid before him. this will be shortly done, and forms one of the first objects of our solicitude. the next will be to furnish you quarterly with such supplies as will render your imprisonment supportable.*”

I would ask why cannot we flatter ourselves with the hope of release from our government? The answer is, *she cannot appear in this business.*

¹“Also a pair of shoes.”

very strange indeed! the present day appears to be an epoch of great importance, and the American government is delicately situated: she wants able men at the helm to steer her through the present crisis, and conduct her to glory. From the little information I can gather of American politics she is disturbed by factions at home and threatened by war from abroad: I have heard that Aaron Burr is to be tried for treason, I think Thomas Jefferson might be tried for the same crime: however I may be mistaken, I may not possess correct information as to what is going forward in the busy world. I anxiously wait for the time when I shall once more visit my native land.

I know from your internal situation you could not know when an opportunity offered of sending letters to this place, might have deterred you from writing; but if my Father would take the trouble of writing me and enclosing the letter to Mr. R. B. Forbes, No. 3 Greenwich Street, or Alpheus Sherman, N. York, who are the acting Committee in behalf of the citizens of New-York and direct the letter to me prisoner, Carthage, it would reach me, the U. S postage must be paid;

During Capt Carson's stay here he has been unremitted in his attentions to the prisoners. he has not only done his duty in delivering the cloathes and money entrusted to his charge but he has visited us almost every day, which I can say is a blessing to men in such a situation to have an opportunity of conversing with a countryman in a foreign country.

Dear Parents I will close this letter by requesting you in case you write me to be very particular in every thing respecting the family, since I left home. My most affectionate love to my Sister Sally and Mr. Allen, also to my brothers Thomas, John, David, and my little Frederick, to my sisters Mary, Eunice, Emeline, Lucy and Harriot, tell them they must not forget me,

my respects to all enquiring friends.

your ever faithful and

affectionate Son

Mr. Jonathan Ingersoll

HENRY INGERSOLL

Eunice Ingersoll.

1807

Sep^r. 26 Cap^t. John O Sullivan made his escape. [He was in the hospital where he had been sent while sick. during the time he lay sick by bribery he obtained a pair of irons with a screw head made in the bolt, by which means [he] could take them off at any time without fear of being discovered. The prisoners while in the hospital seldom had the door of the cell shut. a Centinal was always placed there. this door opened into a yard which communicated with the Street by an opening in the Wall fronting the street. at this place was stationed another Centinel also. No one of the Prisoners were ever allowed to pass the inner Centry into the yard but might approach the door for the purpose of breathing the fresh air. Under these circumstances, Sullivan determined to make a brush. Between Sundown and dark while some

- 1807 of the prisoners engaged the attention of the Centinel in conversation Mr. Sullivan took of his irons unperceived by him and passed into the yard without being discovered here he met one of the attendants of the hospital who before he gave the alarm Sullivan had slipped into his hand several pieces of gold which possessed such powerful charms as completely to shut his mouth. He then rushed passed the guard into the Street. in his way he knocked down the]¹
- Oct. 29 Jeremiah Powell was pardoned by the King of Spain.²
- Nov. 7 After much labor there was a hole cut through a fourteen Foot wall which was the back wall of our cell. eighteen went out. only three made their escape namely William Lippincott John H Sherman³ and Moses Smith the Remainder were taken and confined in stocks and double Irons for more than three months.
- | | | | |
|------|----|------------------------|--|
| 1808 | 28 | Frederick Reggers Died | { those two
men died
from being
confined
a length of time
in stocks |
| May | 25 | Daniel Mackie Died | |

IV. H. INGERSOLL TO HIS PARENTS.

Carthagena prison (S. America) July 4. 1808.

Dear Parents

It is with regret I am again obliged to date my letters in a Spanish prison. The last information we received from the U. S. gave us some hopes we should in time regain our liberty. but it appears that the Committee formed in N. York for the relief of their countrymen in slavery, had no other object in view but to flatter and deceive us. Or that they have fully accomplished their intentions by supplying two or three with money sufficient to make their escape. I have never expected to receive pecuniary assistance from my Parents. but as it is the interest of every man of us to make as many friends in America as possible, I have in my former letters written in what manner my father might be of service to me, and in this letter I will repeat it: for I know of no one action in my whole life (except coming on this Expedition) whereby I have for-

¹ The narrative which Ingersoll wrote out after his return (but apparently before 1811) ends at this point.

² Jeremiah Powell, who joined the expedition at Jacmel, and was made a major in it (Biggs, p. 50) was the son of William Dummer Powell, a judge, afterward Chief Justice, of Upper Canada, see *post*, and *Canadian Archives*, 1892, Upper Canada, pp. 359, 360, 369, 396; *id.*, 1893, Upper Canada, p. 7. Biggs says (p. 246) that Judge Powell procured at London a letter from Dr. Jenner (the discoverer of vaccination), which gained him access to the King of Spain. King Charles IV. had been greatly interested in vaccination, and had sent an expedition around the world to propagate the method in his colonies. *Annual Register*, 1806, pp. 352*-353.*

³ Author of *A General Account of Miranda's Expedition*, New York, 1808.

feited all claim to paternal affection. If our unfortunate situation should ever become a subject of governmental consideration, that my father would represent to *Mr. Bidwell*¹ or whoever may be member of Congress for the County of Berkshire my situation, and if he has the least spark of humanity he cannot but advocate any measure which would tend to our liberation. I am certain that if our pardon was asked of the King of Spain it would be granted immediately. If nothing is done for us generally, then everyone will have to depend on himself, and his friends. If my father was to obtain a recommendation from some of the principal men of Stockbridge in my favor, which I think might be done, and transmit it by the member of Congress to the Marquis de Casa de Yrujo the Spanish Ambassador, together with his representations something might be done in my favor. At any rate I wish my father would write me and send it to the Spanish Ambassador, or to the Spanish Consul in N. York. We have been told that the "government of the U. S. cannot openly appear in this business." I ask why not? are we not American citizens? do we not deserve the protection of our Country; indeed have we not a right to claim it? did we not engage under an officer of the U. States, Col. W^m Smith of N. York.² or Ship on board of the Leander Capt. Lewis under *American colours*. I know there never was men in a similar situation as ourselves. It is also said the government of the U. S. knew nothing of this Expedition: but I say some of the heads did know of it: I will mention some both in and out of office high in the estimation of the U. S. who not only knew but aided and abetted this cursed Expedition. viz: Thomas Jefferson president of the U. S. James Maddison Secretary of State, John Adams the former president of the U. S. and Rufus King formerly minister to England, are a few only who knew of this business. I have every reason to believe that many of our letters to our friends in America have been suppressed by those who were concerned in this Expedition.

In October last Mr. Powel son of Judge Powel of Canada by the exertions of his father received his pardon from the King of Spain. In November last 18 of us broke prison and three only effected their escape. they had been supplied by their friends with money. believe me to be your affectionate and dutiful Son,

H. INGERSOLL

Mr. Jonathan Ingersoll)
Mrs. Eunice Ingersoll)

P. S. If my father should write me, direct to me American Prisoner in Carthagena.

I have nothing more at present to write but my most affectionate love and best wishes to all my brothers and sisters. my compliments to all friends.
H. I.

¹ Barnabas Bidwell, M.C. 1805-1807, a Stockbridge man.

² Col. Wm. S. Smith, surveyor of the port of New York, son-in-law of John Adams.

1808

Aug^s 10 Arrived his majesties Sloop of war Sabrina Cap^t Edw^d Kittoe
with the news of Peace between England and Spain¹

V. THE VICEROY TO CAPTAIN KITTOE.

(Copy of Translation.)

Sir.

Among the many persons captured under Francis Miranda's orders I doubt not there may be some British subjects but they are all criminals and have been tried and sentence passed on them by the Tribunal at Carracas which is wholly independent of my Jurisdiction.² it is therefore out of my power to afford them the relief I would have done in consequence of your intercession of the 12th of August last. Your request in behalf of those who were Prisoners of War has been complied with.

I remain

Sir

Your humble servant,

(Signed)

ANTONIO AMAR.

Vice Roy.

VI. H. INGERSOLL TO BARNABAS BIDWELL.

Vaults of St. Clara, Carthagena, S. America

Oct. 1. 1808.

Respected Sir,

I take the liberty to transmit to you a copy of a memorial of thirty-six American citizens to Congress with a request that you would adopt some sure means to lay it before that body. I am induced to this from a consciousness that when the government of my country is fully acquainted with the treachery and villainies made use of to entrap her citizens into the service of a foreign outlaw she will leave no means untried to rescue them from slavery. We have been nearly three years in irons a part of which time in stocks, not suffered to be let out to answer the ordinary calls of nature. We have already made one representation to the U. States but we fear it has never reached them for we do not find anything is doing in our favor. It is true a subscription was made in N. York for the purpose of sending us supplies, and defraying the expence attending sending on a representation to the Spanish Monarch, but from

¹ For Kittoe, see Marshall's *Naval Biography*, X. 63. He had commanded the *Sabrina*, 18, since the autumn of 1806. During his stay in Carthagena, Capt. Kittoe showed great interest in the prisoners and took active steps for their release. He sent a petition to the Viceroy of Santa Fe (Bogotá), whose jurisdiction extended over the district in which Carthagena was situated. This petition is printed in *American State Papers*, Foreign Affairs, III. 258, and in *Annals of Congress*, Tenth Congress, 2d Session, pp. 491, 492; and therefore is not printed here. The reason for its failure will be found in the reply next given.

² Caracas was in the captain-generalcy of Venezuela, Carthagena in the viceroyalty of New Granada.

the lapse of time we fear nothing has been done. I have no doubt from your known humanity you will do everything that lays in your power to restore to liberty so many innocent men groaning in foreign slavery

As for myself I was not under the same engagements mentioned in the memorial; i. e. to guard the mail from N. Orleans to the city of Washington. I was a passenger on board the ship, otherwise I am in the same predicament mentioned in the petition I have previously written to my father in what way he might convey me a letter, which was to deliver it into your charge to convey to the Marquis de Casa de Yrujo, the Spanish Ambassador at the City of Washington who would transmit it to Carthagera, with a proper representation to the Marquis in my favor, which has already been done by Judge Powell of Canada to his Son in this prison. Mr. Powell obtained the pardon of his Son by going to London himself and from thence to Madrid, but as I have never received any answers to my letters, I fear my friends may think me guilty of the crime of piracy alledged against me; if so, I have but to regret still more my unhappy fate. If you would take charge of a letter from my father, and deliver it to the Spanish Ambassador, with a request to forward it on to me, I shall be under many obligations to you Sir, and shall ever remember it with gratitude.

your most ob^d and humb^l serv^t

HENRY INGERSOLL

Hon. B. Bidwell Esq.

VII. H. INGERSOLL TO DR. HORATIO JONES.

Vaults of St. Clara, Carthagera, S. A. Dec. 6, 1808.

Dear Sir,

On your arrival at Stockbridge from Philadelphia you must have, no doubt, been very much surprised on hearing of my leaving New-York in the expedition of Gen^l Miranda's; an Expedition which has so completely proved my ruin—but I then tho't it was for the best. I am induced to write to you from the hope of receiving an answer, as I have wrote a number of letters to my father, also pointed out the way in which he might convey me an answer but have never received a single line from him. Ere this you must have been informed of every circumstance attending Miranda's expedition, therefore it is unnecessary to enter into a full detail of the subject, but will content myself by mentioning the most material circumstanstes which have have happened to me since I was sentenced to *ten years slavery*.

Soon after sentence was passed on me at Porto-Cavallo I was sent from thence and all my companions to this place. immediately after our arrival here we wrote a memorial to the government of the United States, which, as far as my recollection serves me we sent on to the U. S. in Dec. 1806, but have never heard any thing concerning it. In August of the following year we received a small sum of money and some cloathes from a Committee formed in N. York for the purpose of receiving sup-

plies, and sending them to the Americans in slavery in South America, with assurances from them that they would do every thing in their power to obtain our liberty, and that in the mean time we should receive supplies every three months. in their letter to us they also mentioned, "*you must not deceive yourselves with the hope of release thro' any agency of our government. They cannot appear in this business.*" What authority they had for this assertion I cannot say, or what design they might have had in writing it is equally unknown to me; notwithstanding their fair promises we have never heard any thing further from them. Soon after receiving the above supplies John Sullivan who was Capt. a short time of one of the schrs. which was taken made his escape from the Hospital in this place. he had received some money sent him by his mother in N. York which enabled him to effect his escape with ease.

October of the same year Jeremiah Powell son of Judge Powell of Upper Canada received his Pardon from the King of Spain on the application of his Father. In November following 18 of us broke prison; not being acquainted with the country around Carthagera 3 only effected their escape, whose names were John Sherman, Moses Smith of New York, and Wm. Lippencott of Philadelphia who had been supplied with money by their friends in America. The remainder of us, your humble servant among the rest had the misfortune to be taken six miles from Carthagera, bro't back, our old irons put on, and additional punishment inflicted on us by being confined four months in Stocks, not suffered to be taken out to answer the ordinary calls of nature. We have not been able for upwards of 18 months to obtain any correct information from the U. S. it is true we have understood there has been an embargo laid on the country this some time past, and that America was likely to go to War with England, which may God avert. In August last Edward Kittoe Esq. Commander of H.B.M.y's sloop of War Sabrina arrived at Carthagera with the news of peace between England and Spain. On Captain Kittoe's arrival at this place we acquainted him with our unfortunate situation who immediately sent on a Petition to the Vice Roy of this Province for our Pardon, but more particularly for those who were British subjects, there being nine amongst us who were British born subjects. The Vice Roy returned a very polite answer to Capt. Kittoe's request but as we were tried and sentence passed on us by the Tribunal at Carracas which was wholly independent of his Jurisdiction, he could not grant him his request which he otherwise would have done had it lain in his power. We are much indebted to Capt. Kittoe for his generous interference in our behalf for nothing but humanity and a strong desire to relieve distress could have induced him to the above step. Capt. Kittoe pledged his honor to us he would lay our case before the Royal Junta in Spain and ask himself for our pardon; what will be the result, God only knows, at all events I expect the British subjects will be soon liberated.

Capt. Kittoe sailed from this for Cadis in October last with dispatches, by whom we sent several letters to the U. S. also another memorial to

our government ; I transmitted a Copy enclosed in a letter to the hon. Barnabas Bidwell, Esq. with a request to lay it before Congress, I wish you would enquire if he received it, if he has use your influence with him to have it laid before Congress. Previous to Capt. Kittoe's leaving this he advised us to petition the Capt. General of Carracas, which he would have done himself had he remained in Carthagena long enough to receive an answer we have accordingly done so, and had it translated into Spanish and expect an answer in March next. to add force to our petition we want some one like Capt. Kittoe to back it. Since we have been in Carthagena 6 have died, 4 have made their escape and one obtained his pardon : those who have effected their liberty were men who had friends in N. York or Philadelphia, who supplied them with money, by which means an escape from a Spanish Prison may be effected ; if the persons above mentioned had not got their liberty I fancy ere this [*some*] thing further would have been done for us, but now, owing to the few friends those have in the U. S. who are left in prison, I do not much expect our gov. will take our case into consideration. It has been my opinion this some time that we are kept here from party views. I can gather little or no information from the U. S. but it appears to me that party spirit absorbs every other consideration. It is a disgrace to the U. S. that she suffers her citizens to remain in slavery for I have every reason to believe that Thomas Jefferson not only knew but aided the cursed expedition of Miranda. I am told here we need only be ask'd for, to be liberated. I think my pardon might be obtained by my father thro' the means of the American Consul in Spain, during the present critical situation of that Country.

Since the Peace between England and Spain there is a continual intercourse between Jamaica and this place which enables us to send directly to the U. S. thro' the same channel letters might be conveyed to me, therefore I hope Doct. Jones will not fail to write ; send the letter to some correspondent of yours in N. York to be forwarded to Jamaica ; direct to me, *American prisoner, Cartagena, de Indies* to the care of Mr. Beard, Proprietor of the American Hotel, Jamaica, who will forward it on to me.

Your esteemed friend,

H. INGERSOLL

Doct. Horatio Jones

N. B. A Mr. Saunders one of my unfortunate companions, has just completed a pamphlet, containing a full account of Miranda's Expedition.¹ The material from which he has collected this little book he procured from a James Gardner who suffered death at Porto-Cavallo, the evening previous to his execution. It appears very correct, and I believe will receive a general reading and excite the indignation of every honest American. It will unmask a number of persons who have hitherto possessed the confidence of their countrymen and enjoyed the highest posts

¹ For Robert Saunders, see *American State Papers*, Foreign Relations, III. 257, 258.

of honor and profit within the gift of a free and enlightened people and prove them to be the abettors of a most abandoned and unprincipled villain. Mr. Gardner attended a number of the secret meetings of the persons residing in N. York previous to the departure of the Expedition.

P. S. I wrote to my father by the last conveyance to Jamaica, which was in November last. if America goes to war with England, I do not expect my letters will reach home. The memorial which I sent to Mr. Bidwell I expect will go by the way of Europe. Give my duty and affection to my father and mother, my love to all my brothers and sisters, my respects to Mrs. Jones and compliments to my fellow student Wm. Brown, also to all enquiring friends.

yours, &c.

H. INGERSOLL.

[Superscription]

Doct. Horatio Jones, Post-Master.

Stockbridge—Berkshire County,

Massachusetts.

U. S. A.

pr. Capt. Curtis { To the care of Mr. Beard, Proprietor of the American
Hotel, Kingston, Jamaica.

1809

Feb. 2 Don Antonio Narvaez General of the troops of Carthagera
ordered John Moore out of Prison on Parole

VIII. H. INGERSOLL TO T., J. AND D. INGERSOLL.¹

[Carthagera S. America, Feb^r 3, 1809.]

Dear Brothers

I have just returned from the King's Hospital in this place recovered from a severe fit of sickness. thank God I am now tolerably well. you must, ere this, all be well acquainted with the circumstances of my imprisonment, some occurrences however, may not be unworthy of notice. four of my unfortunate companions have made their escape since we have been in Carthagera, owing to their receiving assistance from their friends in America; several have died, *one* has received his pardon from the King of Spain CHARLES THE FOURTH on the application of his Father, who is a gentleman of some influence with the British Ministry. Not long since there arrived at this place H. B. M's sloop of war Sabrina, Edward Kittoe, Esq. commander, with the news of peace between England and Spain, and owing to the shameful neglect of the American government towards us for nearly three years, nine amongst us who were british-born subjects, (but who had a just right to claim the protection of America) made known to Capt. Kittoe their situation acknowledging themselves british subjects, and claiming protection

¹ A copy of this letter, without the postscript, was made in the same handwriting, but shows no sign of having been mailed. The letter itself is marked as forwarded by Mr. Macpherson of Kingston.

as such. In consequence of which Capt. Kittoe generously exerted himself in the behalf of us all, he sent on a petition to the Vice Roy of this province at *St. Fe* for our pardon; the Vice Roy made answer that as we were sentenced by the Captain General of Carraccas who was wholly independent of him, therefore he could not grant him his request, which he otherwise would have done. previous to Capt. Kittoe's sailing from this for Cadis he advised us to petition the Captain General of Carraccas for our pardon, which we did, had it translated into Spanish and sent it on to Carraccas when Capt. Kittoe sailed we gave him a memorial to our government for him to forward; he also took a representation of our situation to the *royal junta* at Seville in Spain, which he promised he would lay before them and ask himself for our pardon; the result of which time alone will unfold. in case all of us being refused eventually the british subjects will be cleared.

The British subjects also petitioned his Grace the Duke of Manchester governor of Jamaica, making known to him their situation, requesting him to use his influence with the Spanish governors to alleviate their sufferings. I understand the Duke published their petition in Jamaica with an answer that he could do nothing for them in his *official* capacity at present, as it would be anticipation on his part to attempt it, as Capt. Kittoe had, ere this, represented all our situations to the Royal Junta in Spain. however there are now in port two English vessels, the one from Europe, the other from Jamaica, one of the Captains bro't letters for a Mr. John Moore,¹ one of the british subjects (also some money) whose father is a Capt. in the British service, his Uncle a Col. James Moore, he has also other relations of high birth—rank goes a great way with the Spaniards. I believe Mr. Moore has recommendations from gentlemen in Jamaica to some Spanish officers in this country; at any rate, in consequence of the exertions of the English captains, together with the wish of the Spaniards at the present moment to do the English favors, *Don Antonio Narvaes* a Spanish Lieutenant-General used his influence with the Governor of Carthagená to have Mr. Moore's irons taken off which has been done, and is to go his security to take him out of prison to his house till his pardon can be obtained; I expect he will go to the general's house in a few days; the English Captains are making every exertion that lays in their power to relieve their country men, in fact they do every thing for us all they can; but they *can do nothing* for the Americans. thus you see one or two private Englishmen are doing everything to relieve their countrymen, while America sits idly looking on, and sees her citizens in slavery without making one single exertion to relieve them.

Dear Brothers

I have written a number of letters to my dear Parents one to my brother Thomas Allen one to Barnabas Bidwell, Esq. to whom I enclosed a memorial to Congress requesting him to lay it before that hon. body; also one to Doct. Jones, in the major part of my letters I

¹ Called John Edward Moore in the pardon.

have pointed out the way in which letters might reach me, but have never received an answer to any of them. It is an additional cause of grief to my other sufferings that I am unable to hear from my friends, and at the same time not knowing but my parents may think me guilty of the crime alledged against me. it cannot be that by one act of my youthful days I have forfeited all claim to Parental or brotherly affection, especially as by that act I tho't I was not only rendering my self a service but supposed the ruinous Expedition in which I engaged was perfectly fair and honorable, I believed at that time and do now that it was known to the President and the other heads of Departments in the United States

Direct to me, *American prisoner, Carthagera, to the care of J. M. Macpherson, Kingston, Jamaica*; the letter can be easily forwarded from New York to Jamaica.

My most affectionate love to my dear Father and Mother, all my Sisters and to my little brother Frederick. in the mean time believe me to be your affectionate

Brother

To Mr. Thomas, Jonathan, jun.
and David Ingersoll—
Brothers, Stockbridge,
Berkshire County, Mass.

HENRY INGERSOLL

Vaults of St. Clara,

Carthagera, S. America, Feb' 3, 1809.

P. S. Since writing the above, *Mr. Moore* has been taken out of the prison and sent to Gen. Narvae's house.

H. I.

1809

March 16 William Carthright Died

Ap' 1 Received Four Hundred Dollars which the good Citizens of Jamaica subscribed for our relief

9 Thro' the interest of Dⁿ Antonio Narvaez the Vice Roy of St Fe ordered the Irons taken off of all those that own^d themselves Englishmen and a single one put on

17 Hugh Smith a boy about 12 Years old, Mr. Scott an Englishman took out of Prison, on bail.

IX. H. INGERSOLL TO HIS PARENTS.

Carthagera de Indies, April 24, 1809.

Dear Parents

I consider I have done my duty towards you in letting you know at various times my miserable situation. I now intreat you by all the affection you ever had for your unfortunate Son to convey him a few lines. I have lived (I can scarcely say live but existed) during my confinement with a distant hope that I should yet one day enjoy the blessings of liberty—but I fear I have encouraged a false hope, it was that alone which cheered me in my solitary hours and kept me alive thus long

—but I now give over every hope and expect to make my exit in prison ; still, whatever may be my lot I shall always recollect with tears of thankfulness the kind instructions of my dear parents, particularly the tender and affectionate care of my dear mother during my youth. Were I so disposed I could fill sheets to prove to you that the U. States in whatever light we are considered are culpable in their neglect towards us. Direct to me, American Prisoner, Cartagena *de Indics*, to the care of J. M. Macpherson Kingston Jamaica who will forward it to this place.
your dutiful and affectionate Son,

HENRY INGERSOLL

Mr. Jonathan Ingersoll

Mrs. Eunice Ingersoll.

X. G. BACCHUS TO E. BACON.

(Copy.)

Phil^a May 19th 1809

Hon^l Ezekial Bacon Esq.¹

Dear Sir

I drop you a few lines on the subject of those poor unfortunate people who are in the Santa Clara Prison at Carthagena on the Spanish Main.

I have to inform you that I am going out to Laguira and perhaps Porto OBello a few leagues to leeward and two or three days sail from Carthagena. I now offer a tender of my services and would proceed down to Carthagena, and endeavor to relieve those unfortunate people who have been suffering there such a length of time. As Congress will not do any thing in this business, it might be done by Subscriptions being set on foot here, New York, Boston, Salem, and Baltimore. I am confident a Sum would be subscribed in one week adequate to every expence that might attend such a voyage. Letters must be obtained from the new Spanish Minister and from Mr. Erskine the British Minister, to the Vice Roy of that province who resides at St. Fe 900 miles from Carthagena, the expence of sending express would be considerable and a detention of forty days this must be done before August as their rainy Season begins when the roads in that Country are impassable.

I have been at Carthagena and know the difficulty of doing business in that Country. if necessary I could go to Carraccas and get letters from the Gov. Gen^l there to the Vice Roy. at any rate if they could not be released their distresses might be alleviated. The best way to get this business into immediate motion would be to get a Member of Congress to write on to some respectable House here to set a subscription on foot in N. York and Boston, &c. Doct. Eustis would be a good hand to speak to about it. Jn^o. Gardner Jun^r here and Noah Talcott New-York, would be a good house to set the business a going there. Gen^l. Smith of Baltimore would be a good hand to put the motion there. If you think any

¹ Ezekiel Bacon, a lawyer of Stockbridge, was M. C. from 1807 to 1813.

thing can be done in the business write me here to care of Jn^o Gardner Jun^r and all attention on my part shall be in force to accomplish the desired effect. I can give every satisfaction necessary as to my responsibility and will get letters to that effect if any thing will be done. your immediate reply will be necessary as I don't wish to be detained long on acc^t of this business on an uncertainty. I speak the Spanish Language which would facilitate the business.

I am

With esteem

Yours most ob^d Serv^t

GURDON BACCHUS.

I think \$1000 might be raised here by the Equestrian Company in one night. it would take very quick. I will mention this business to some of the Merchants here and drop you a few lines in a day or two.

G. B.

1809

- April 29 Joseph Heckle a boy of 12 years old made his escape from the place he used to work at.
- May 20 John Moor and Henry Ingersoll rec^d their pardon from the Royal Junta in Spain

•
XI. H. INGERSOLL TO HIS FATHER.

Georgetown, *district of Columbia* July 15. 1809.

Dear Father

I have the indescribable satisfaction to inform you of my arrival in this town last night from Carthagena prison having received my pardon from the Royal Junto of Spain, which was a most agreeable surprise at present inexplicable to me, having never received any letters during my imprisonment; to whom I am indebted for my liberty I know not, but shall always consider myself under great obligation to them and hope I shall never be deficient either in gratitude or thanks. I hope my father will inform me in what manner my pardon was procured. My pardon says, "*It is in consequence of my good faith and character, and little experience,*" &c. At present I wish to lay myself under further obligations to my parents. when I received my pardon I was sick at the Hospital without either clothes or money, therefore I was under the necessity to draw an order on my father for sixty dollars, which money I obtained from Mr. Samuel Ober Supercargo of the schooner Citizen of this place. With a promise that it should be paid soon after my arrival, the Capt. of said schooner gave me a passage home. Perhaps my father may think I was too extravagant, but I assure him I could not do with less, in my next I will be more particular, suffice it to say, expended for a change of clothes \$35, which was as cheap as I could do with, on a voyage at Sea, my expences in Carthagena together with the necessary documents of my pardon for which I had to pay \$10 one barrel of bread which the circumstances of the vessel rendered it necessary for me to put a-board \$10 more, and five

dollars I had on my arrival at this place in all amounting to \$60. which if it is possible I wish my father to remit on to me as I have promised it should soon be paid. if it is difficult for my father to obtain the money I hope to be able in a few months to refund it, as I will go to work if possible and not return home till I can pay it. A few days after my irons were taken off, in consequence of my being so long confined and suddenly set at liberty, my ancles were so swelled and lame I tho't I should lose the use of my legs, but after being one week or ten days at Sea I recovered the use of them. I hope my brother Thomas will afford me some assistance, when he considers that I have been unfortunate, and perhaps I shall yet one day have it in my power to make ample recompence, sure he cannot deny me. do not my dear father disappoint me in this my request. I wish my father to inform me what means were made use of to obtain me my liberty; also the particular state of the family. My most tender and affectionate love to my dear mother, all my brothers and sisters.

in haste, your affectionate Son,

Mr. J. Ingersoll.

HENRY INGERSOLL.

P. S. Direct to me Georgetown, district of Columbia.

XII. H. INGERSOLL TO T. INGERSOLL.

Washington City July 20, 1809.

Dear Brother,

Last week I wrote to my father informing him of my liberation, and arrival at Georgetown, also requesting him if possible to send me \$60 which money I received from Mr. Samuel Ober, Supercargo of the schooner Citizen, at Carthagen. in that letter I requested that you would assist me if it laid in your power, which I now repeat hoping that you will not deny me. In my letter to my father I requested he would inform me what means had been made use of to effect my liberty since which, as I suspected, I find the Hon. Mr. Bidwell, and E. Bacon have in some measure contributed towards it. Also from a paragraph under the Stockbridge head of July 1, I observe an application was made by Mr. Erskine the British Minister, to the Spanish Ambassador. I wish to be informed of every thing respecting this transaction. I have had access to the Journals of the House of Congress, and have obtained copies of some documents, which was laid before them, respecting our petition, and am sorry to find that the report of the Committee in our behalf was lost, in consequence of the Speaker's decision. I had determined to be very minute and particular in this letter, but find myself incapable; I have not yet composed myself, so many objects having at once crowded upon me that I hardly know what to do or where I am, in fact, I sometimes doubt whether I am not dreaming all this while; would to God, however, I had arrived here during the session of Congress. I should have been of service to my fellow prisoners. I have matter enough to fill sheets, and was my mind at perfect ease I should know where to commence. Allowances are to be made for my present situation, therefore this unconnected scroll is excusable.

About the 20th of May, I was informed my liberty had arrived in Carthagena, from Spain; *Genl. Narvaes* was the person who sent me the above information; the joyful sensations the above excited, mingled with those of a different nature, are too great and difficult to be described. The afternoon of the same day I was visited by Don Manuel Ribero, of Carthagena, congratulating me on my restoration to liberty, friends and country, politely requesting me to make his house my home while in Carthagena, which I gladly accepted; I was ten days in prison before an order from the Governor could be procured to have my irons knocked off, which will give you a faint idea of the dilatory method of procedure amongst the Spaniards; those 10 days appeared to me the longest ever I experienced in my life; at last the blessed day arrived when I was once more set at liberty; the happiest day to me I consider of my whole life, the 30th of May, *Fernando 7th*'s birth day; let those who have experienced the various vicissitudes of human life, or who have seen or felt misfortunes in various shapes form an idea of my reflections at that moment, no other can; after being 3 long years 1 month and 2 days closely confined, and in irons during that time; suddenly to enjoy the sunshine of liberty is a species of happiness few experience. The Gov.'s Secretary took me out of prison; before whom (the Gov.) it was necessary I should be presented before I could obtain my pass to leave Carthagena, to whose palace I was conducted, but he not being at home it was delayed till the next day; in the mean time, I was conducted to the house of Don Manuel's, at which place the Secretary was to call for me the next day at 10 o'clock. at the hour appointed I was taken before the Gov. on observing me, and being informed I was the person included in the Royal order of the 22nd of Feb. ultimo, he arose, gently bowed, eyed me from head to foot, spoke not a word, but seemed from the pleasant smile which was fixed on his countenance, to rejoice at my success, and turning around into an adjoining apartment, gave orders for the proper officer, to attend me to the public office, where I was to receive my passport and a copy of the Royal Order, there I wrote my name, which he filed with the public records, and after a delay of a few days, obtained my necessary papers; in the mean time I continued at Don Manuel's at perfect liberty; as soon as I had procured myself a suit of clothes any way decent to appear in the public streets I waited on Genl. Antonio Narvaes; for a description of which interview, you must wait until my next, as I have spun this letter already to a great length; enquire after my old friend J. Hunt, request him to write me; direct to Washington City; my duty to my Parents, love and affection to my brothers and Sisters, give my respects to Doct. Jones and wife, and suffer none of this to appear in public print. write me by the next mail, and believe me to be

your affectionate brother,

[Superscription,]

H. INGERSOLL.

Mr. Thomas Ingersoll,
Stockbridge, Mass.

XIII. HENRY D. SEDGWICK TO H. INGERSOLL.¹

Stockbridge 8th Aug' 1809

My dear friend,

I have written You four or five letters three of which You certainly have not received and I sincerely hope You may not this as it will arrive at Washington after the time when We hope You will have left there. The only object in writing is inspired by a bare possibility that the letters sent by a number of your friends here to You after hearing your arrival in Washington did not arrive safely. In one of those letters was inclosed the sum of \$100 in two \$50 bills, which it was thought might be sufficient for your present wants. So sparing a calculation would not have been made had you not confined your request to your father to the small sum of \$60. If any thing more is necessary, You will let me or some other of your friends here know immediately and You certainly will not delay a communication of that kind from any motives of delicacy. If however under your circumstances You should be so unreasonable as to entertain such a feeling towards your friends, You may obviate it by considering all *future advances* as a loan to be repaid when it shall be perfectly convenient.

The history of your liberation was sent You by our former letters, but as the only reason for writing now is the possibility that those letters did not arrive, I shall briefly state all that is here known of it. Some time last fall, I think in the month of November my Father wrote to Mr Erskine the British Minister requesting his influence and exertions to effect that object. Mr Erskine made an application to Mr Hammond one of his former opposition friends who in the change of ministry retained his place of Under Secretary of State. Mr Hammond who fortunately was formerly in this country and here acquainted with my Father immediately took a warm interest in the affair.² He was successful in obtaining the interference of Admiral Apodaca Ambassador from the Spanish Junta to the Court of St. James, and it seems that the request of that minister to his government was granted without the slightest delay. In reviewing the means by which this most joyful event has been effected it is scarcely possible not to recognize the beneficent interposition of Providence. At a crisis of the world when the slaughter of thousands is a thing of daily occurrence and scarcely of a day's recollection, ministers and governments whose kingdoms are now swimming and now sinking in the vortex of the whirlpool of revolution have promptly and efficaciously cooperated for the release of an unknown individual confined thousands of miles from them. The least coldness or delay in a single person who formed a link in the chain of communication would have probably have been fatal. Throughout your life this will be a theme of

¹ This letter evidently failed to reach Georgetown before Ingersoll's departure, since it was returned to Stockbridge unopened. Henry Dwight Sedgwick (1785-1831) was the second son of Judge Theodore Sedgwick, of Stockbridge.

² George Hammond, minister to the United States from 1791 to 1795, was under secretary of state for foreign affairs from 1795 to 1806 and from 1807 to 1809.

praise and gratitude to your God, and of most pleasing reflection and I trust improvement to yourself.

If an opportunity should present You will without doubt make your acknowledgments in person to Mr. Erskine. Your Father and Mother have written him two letters or rather one with a duplicate which were forwarded to New York and Philadelphia as We had learned from the papers that Mr Erskine had left Washington for the latter place. He however returned before the letter directed to Philadelphia could have reached that city. If You find that neither of the letters have been received, You can send them on.

We are waiting with the utmost impatience to see You. Your family entreat that You will not delay your return a single moment longer than is absolutely necessary. The last of next week is the time generally fixed on for your arrival.

With the utmost affection

I am Your friend

HENRY D SEDGWICK.

Mr. Henry Ingersoll,
[Washington.]

P.S. The postage is not paid from the improbability that this letter will ever reach You.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

The Evolution of the Aryan. By RUDOLPH VON IHERING. Translated from the German by A. DRUCKER, M. P. (New York: Henry Holt and Co. 1897. Pp. xviii, 418.)

CLASSIFYING the one hundred or more treatises since Omalius d'Halloy's first attempt in 1848, which have endeavored to throw light upon the origin of the modern peoples of Europe, we distinguish four clearly marked groups. The earliest was entirely historical, deriving its conclusions from classical literature and the testimony of the ancients; to this succeeded the methods of the philologists, led by Max Müller; then the ethnographers, Bertrand, Reinach, Montelius and their fellows, concerning themselves primarily with the study of arts and customs; and finally the physical anthropologists and prehistoric archaeologists, who deal in terms of head-form, color of hair or eyes, stature, and other purely physical traits. Little by little, as each mode of research has contributed its quota of information, the problems at issue have likewise become differentiated. From a primary confusion of race, culture, and language, we have learned to distinguish each in turn as to its origin and development, apart from the others.

The anthropologists of to-day recognize a complexity of racial origins which was unsuspected a generation ago. Diversity of physical types, each possessed of a distinct racial history, is as fully proved as is the immigration of Europe's civilization, independently of any particular racial type, from some centre toward the south-east. And now, Sergi and others, not content with this differentiation, are tracing an origin, development and immigration of language bearing little relation to either culture or physical types. Certain it is that the word *Aryan* is peculiarly a linguistic term, appertaining to a family of languages; possibly to a group of cultures; but absolutely worthless as designating any racial type. Unless these points be firmly grasped, the entire significance of this uncompleted and posthumous work of perhaps the greatest of German jurists is entirely lost. It is a misnamed book, abominably translated, which, however, contains certain brilliant interpretations of the primitive legal customs of the Semitic and Aryan-speaking peoples of the prehistoric period. More than this of direct contribution to knowledge is utterly lacking. Nay, the learned author, in his ignorance of the results from any other than the philological field, and in the sweeping character of his generalizations, has rather contributed to retard the normal differentiation of problems which has happily been taking place of late. The one justification for the volume is its critical treatment of the legal customs of Babylonia as preserved in its brick tablets. These are of conspicuous interest in any history of civilization. For all other customs, arts or

details of prehistoric culture the student will more profitably turn to Schrader's *Prehistoric Antiquities of the Aryan Peoples*, or to Canon Taylor's admirable little *Origin of the Aryans*. In all save the legal sections the work is so obviously out of touch with the most recent literature upon the subject that detailed discussion of its conclusions is unnecessary.

One feature of this volume deserves mention in passing. It affords additional proof of that tendency toward emphasis of environmental influences in history to which I have heretofore adverted at some length.¹ Thus the main purpose in the second book (p. 75) is "to bring out clearly the connection of the national character of a people with the soil upon which it lives;" or again (p. 226) to seize the "unparalleled opportunity" for proving the "causal connection between soil and people." In places, it must be confessed, traces of senility appear in the absurd development of this theorem; as for example (p. 84) where at great length the story of Cain and Abel, the former typefying agriculture, the other personating pastoral life, is laboriously developed into a general law of cultural progress. The work, with its interesting side-lights upon the origins of law, while but half finished at the author's death, marks the conclusion of a long life of marvellous intellectual activity.

WILLIAM Z. RIPLEY.

Law and Politics in the Middle Ages, with a Synoptic Table of Sources. By EDWARD JENKS, M.A., Reader in English Law in the University of Oxford. (New York: Henry Holt and Company. 1898. Pp. xiii, 352.)

This is a brilliant book, and it will be a perfect godsend to many a young student of legal history. It tries to do,—and, so far as exposition is concerned, in large measure succeeds in doing,—what Sir Henry Maine did in so masterly a manner: light up the forest of technical detail with a few great generalizations, and make even the forms of legal procedure illustrate social evolution. Fifteen years have passed since the last of Maine's notable books, the *Early Law and Custom*, was given to the world. During the interval, Seebohm, Maitland, and Round have made very large additions to our knowledge of early English institutions; while with Brunner and Schröder, Viollet and Esmein coming to be familiar names to English and American students, a beginning has been made in the direction of a Comparative Jurisprudence worthy of the name. Yet if the older generation of law students troubled themselves too little about history, the present generation are in some danger of being overwhelmed by the multiplicity of historical particulars commended to their attention. There might seem to be room for a new venture in generalization; and Mr. Jenks, with an experience unusually wide for a comparatively young writer,—including as it does personal observation of the workings of Aus-

¹ *Political Science Quarterly*, X. 636-655.

tralian democracy,—and with a style both clear and forcible, would seem to be in some ways peculiarly well qualified for the task. He has, indeed, produced a fascinating book. Mr. Jenks has not only large ideas and a large way of handling them; he has also the gift of phrase. "The Frank Empire was a sham Empire," "Trial by Jury gives the death-blow to trial by peers;" phrases like these will cling to the memory.

Yet, though we congratulate the reader, we cannot but feel some regret that Mr. Jenks should have written the book just at the present stage of historical investigation. What he sets before us is a new key to mediæval history. This he finds in the struggle between the State and the Clan, and almost the whole book is a working-out of the thesis. The exception is the first two chapters; in which he describes the "sources," with a view both to explaining what they are, and to showing the inapplicability of the Austinian definition of "law." This last would hardly seem necessary for those who had once read Maine's lucid lectures on sovereignty; but Mr. Jenks doubtless knows his audience. The remaining chapters, four-fifths of the book, are all occupied with an explanation of the way in which this struggle, first of the state against the clan proper and then against feudalism, which our author views as a reversion to the clan type, is reflected in the history of the administration of justice, of land settlement, of legal ideas of possession and property, and of the conception of contract.

But what is or was a "clan?" This is Mr. Jenks' pet word, and, so far as I know, he is the first writer to make much use of it. One has a right to expect something like a definition; and yet throughout the book there is no more exact account than this,—“a body of relatives” “larger and somewhat (more) indefinite” than a “household” (p. 162). The author takes for granted that everybody knows what a “clan” is; but as a matter of fact we are all very vague on the subject, and our notion of it shifts to and fro between a large “family” and a small “tribe.” It sometimes looks as if this were the case with Mr. Jenks also; for much that he says about the state “using the law of inheritance as a means of destroying the clan” (pp. 225 *seq.*) might be regarded equally well as but steps in the destruction of the agnatic family. The word “clan” reminds us, to begin with, of Scotland. But the early history of the Scotch clan has yet to be written; and any investigator will have to reckon with Skene's view of it as a later development out of the tribe, owing to the pressure of economic conditions, and by means of something like contract. Where we are first introduced to the word by Mr. Jenks, we are told that the Teutonic state grew out of a “league of clans.” This is said to be a common result of war, and we are asked in a note (p. 99) to “see this idea excellently worked out by Morgan” in his chapter on the Iroquois Confederacy. But with Morgan the confederacy was a confederacy of “tribes,” on the basis of common *gentes* (in Morgan's sense of *gentes*). Instead of being “not homogeneous” and “based on entirely different principles” from the clan (p. 74), Morgan's confederacy arose by “natural growth,” and “demonstrates the

reality as well as persistency of the bond of kin" (*Ancient Society*, p. 134). With Mr. Jenks "clan" is apparently (in some passages) much the same as the Roman *gens* (p. 162). Then were the "Tacitean clans, the Chatti, the Chauci, the Cherusci" (p. 73) *gentes*? As soon as we begin to ask questions like these we must realize the need for a far more definite terminology than we as yet possess. "Family" and "gens" and "phratry" and "clan" and "tribe" must all be given a clear connotation before we can make any scientific use of them. Something is being done by Mr. Seebohm in his study of Celtic institutions, much by Mr. Baden-Powell in his description of Indian conditions. Both of these, indeed, throw about the adjective "tribal" somewhat too freely; and perhaps even more is to be hoped from anthropology, now that, thanks to Professor Westermarck, it also has got rid of the spectacles of theory. If Mr. Jenks could have waited until his starting-point had been a little clearer, his work, I am sure, would have been of more permanent value.

All criticism in detail is so relatively unimportant that it is hardly worth while dwelling upon it. But it may be of use to briefly set down a few points in the order in which they occur: P. 42. The comparison of the Plantagenet Assises with "the rules" which "the lord of a domain may make for its management, at least with the concurrence of his managing officials" (cf. pp. 90 and 99 n. 16) is surely hardly safe. It is difficult to reconcile with the remark that "we shall never understand mediæval history unless we distinguish between the *domain* of the king which he held . . . as feudal proprietor, and the royal rights" (p. 88), or with the *de consilio omnium baronum* (Assise of Clarendon), the *per consilium et assensum* . . . *episcoporum et baronum* . . . (Assise of the Forest) of the ordinances themselves. With Mr. Jenks' view may be compared the judicious utterances of Bishop Stubbs, *Constitutional History*, I. § 160.

P. 66. The part played by Parliament would seem to be overstated. The peculiarity of English history lies not so much in the existence of a parliament as in its relation to the executive; especially during the Tudor period, when the executive, acting through the Council and Star Chamber, was uniquely successful in enforcing the law, and yet, for some reason or other, did not try to dispense with Parliament.

P. 152. "Tacitus describes . . . a shifting from one ploughland (*arvum*) to another. In other words . . . the Germans have discovered the secret of fallows and rotation of crops." See also the note 7, p. 185, where we are asked to "compare the discussion" of the Tacitus passage by Fustel de Coulanges in his *Recherches*. Whatever Fustel's positive conclusion may have been, and, though obscurely expressed, it seems to be *Feldgraswirthschaft*, his negative conclusion is clear. "Nous ne nous arrêtons pas à l'opinion de Eichhorn, qui a d'ailleurs été réfutée par Roscher et par Waitz. Il suffit de remarquer qu'il n'y a pas dans tout le chapitre un seul mot qui implique une alternance de produits agricoles ou une habitude régulière d'assolement." *Recherches*, p. 264.

P. 168. "In the Anglo-Saxon laws we note the appearance of the lord of land who takes his place as of right alongside of the reeve and

men of the township in the Hundred and Shire moots," referring to Schmid, App. XXI. 7, § 2, in which, however, there is no mention of any "men of the township" at all.

P. 169. "The village moot has been replaced by the hall moot." But has not Mr. Maitland made it clear that there is no evidence for a "village moot?" See recently, *Domesday Book and Beyond*, p. 353.

P. 213. That "even among the Ribuarian Franks . . . the conveyance of land took place in the public moot" is among the bits of evidence produced to show that "the other members of the village group had originally to be consulted." But as the same rule was common with regard to all sales (*e. g.*, p. 200, top), this fact, if it suggests any conclusion, suggests too much.

W. J. ASHLEY.

Feudal Relations between the Kings of England and Scotland under the Early Plantagenets. By CHARLES T. WYCKOFF. (Chicago: University Press. 1897. Pp. xv, 159.)

THIS doctoral dissertation is a monograph on a subject which has been dealt with at considerable length in certain historical works, namely the dependence or alleged dependence of Scotland from the time of Edward the Elder to the close of the thirteenth century. There was certainly an opening for a treatise on this question, setting forth all the evidence from first to last; while the national prejudice shown by writers in Great Britain makes it specially appropriate that the task should be approached, as it were from without, by an American writer. Mr. Wyckoff has produced an admirable and most scholarly dissertation; but one feels that his sympathies, throughout, are with the Scottish case. This, no doubt, is a natural reaction from the latest writer on the subject, Professor Freeman, who took an extreme line in his *History of the Norman Conquest*, arguing, throughout, against the conclusions of the Scottish historian Robertson.

Where, as in this case, the evidence is restricted, and has been long minutely examined not only by historical writers, but by diplomatic experts, it is scarcely possible to find anything new to say. Mr. Wyckoff devotes his chief efforts to distinguishing between the homage due for (1) the kingdom of Scotland, (2) Lothian, (3) Tyndale and other possessions to the south of the Tweed. His object is to show that advantage has been taken, on the English side, of the confusion naturally arising from the complex character of the relations between the kings of England and Scotland. Denying that the latter performed homage to an English overlord for their kingdom, he admits, of course, a homage rendered for possessions in England, and recognizes the ambiguous character of the relations as to Lothian. By the treaty of Falaise Henry II. extorted from William the Lion a real admission of his overlordship, as over the kingdom of Scotland; but this Mr. Wyckoff urges was its earliest recognition. And the work of Henry, as we know, was undone by Richard.

The real difficulty of forming a definite conclusion is found in that element of forgery and interpolation which, apart from Hardyng's rascalities, pervades the evidence. Who, for instance, could speak positively on "the great commendation" of 924, in the light of the MSS., or on the contested charter of Edgar relating to Lothian? Mr. Wyckoff, however, has rendered a real service by discussing the question as a whole and chronologically. It is particularly gratifying to European scholars to find American students accomplishing good work in medieval fields. The bibliography appended to these dissertations is a useful feature; but neither Earle's edition of the Chronicles nor the subsequent work of Mr. Plummer is mentioned in it.

J. H. ROUND.

Marino Faliero: La Congiura. By VITTORIO LAZZARINI. [Estratto dal Nuovo Archivio Veneto, tomo XIII., parte I.-II.] (Venezia: coi Tipi dei Fratelli Visentini. 1897. Pp. 205.)

IN the present publication the short and tragic government of the doge Marino Faliero has been investigated with a thoroughness which, if it does not dispel every doubt that may be reasonably entertained about the celebrated conspiracy connected with that doge's name, at least sets into clear view all its larger aspects. Signor Lazzarini has performed a most scholarly piece of work. His exhaustive information about Marino Faliero he has presented under rubrics which embrace every phase of the case and though seemingly detached have a perfect logical unity. Part I., constituting a kind of preface, is a discussion of the sources and the bibliography of the subject. In this part the author enumerates first the documents, which, by the way, are few and unprofitable; then, considering in chronological order the records and histories which deal with the tragedy of the doge, he accompanies each with a brief estimate of its value. Part II. deals with Marino Faliero, his public life, and his election in 1354 to the highest office in the state. Part III. contrasts the famous legend of the insult of the doge by young and gay patricians with the facts as established by the documents. Part IV. narrates the history of the conspiracy, its discovery, and the execution of the doge. A number of additional parts discuss various matters of minor importance, such as accomplices, punishments and so forth, and, finally, an appendix treats of several detached problems of a sentimental interest, such as Faliero's sepulchre and Faliero's portrait, and, best of all, offers a reprint of the documents gathered by the author in the state archives of Venice.

The evidence collected by Lazzarini for the case of Marino Faliero is so complete, the intelligence and carefulness with which he has sifted that evidence are so conspicuous, that we have reason to expect that Lazzarini's presentation will be accepted as final. What then is it that the author has done for the story of the famous doge? In the first place he has cut away half a dozen of the myths which, gathering about the conspiracy from the day of its discovery as moss and ivy gather over ruined

houses, have luxuriantly spread and have finally to the careless eye obscured the features of the original event. Thus we may once for all dismiss as legendary the witchery of the *dogaressa* in whose beautiful face, as if it were the face of another Helen, romancing chroniclers were disposed to discover the prime source of the subsequent disasters. Likewise we may much reduce the traditional proportions of the insult offered to the doge by riotous members of the nobility. Lazzarini has clearly shown: (1) that an insult put upon a doge was nothing unique in Venetian annals; and (2) that the punishment which was meted out to the culprits and which is usually represented as ridiculously light, was fully as severe as the practice of the century prescribed.

Having cut away, one after another, the mythical incidents of the conspiracy, Lazzarini puts before us finally a small but compact kernel of facts. These facts soberly considered suffice to transfer the history of Marino Faliero from the nebular realm of Byronism, to which it has been so long confined, to this our earth, and set it upon a solid and reasonable foundation of human motive and contemporary circumstance. Lazzarini's demonstration will leave little doubt in any mind that if Marino Faliero did not, like a mere vain, bungling fool, undertake to overthrow the mighty oligarchy of Venice because he had been lampooned by some swaggering dandies, neither did he, moved by vague premonitions of an era of *liberté, égalité, fraternité*, attempt to supplant the nefarious regimen of the aristocracy by a popular government. It seems quite plain from Lazzarini that the dominating idea of the conspiring doge was personal and political. He simply wished to free himself from the restrictions with which in the course of time the Venetian executive had been shackled and to acquire, after the fashion of the contemporary despots of Padua, Milan, Verona, and all northern Italy, the *dominium* or absolute power over the Venetian realm. It is only too probable that in this desire he was confirmed by personal animosities, but motives of this nature we cannot help assigning in the case of so experienced and politic a gentleman as Faliero to a secondary rank.

These results, here briefly outlined, can hardly be called new. They are embodied in the reputable histories of Venice from Leo down to Battistella. Lazzarini's merit, therefore, does not consist in the novelty of his presentation; it consists rather in having buttressed the old surmises and deductions with such masses of interesting and assured facts that the ancient hypotheses transform themselves under our eyes to indubitable statements.

FERDINAND SCHWILL.

The Diplomatic History of America. Its First Chapter. 1452-1493-1494. By HENRY HARRISSE. (London: B. F. Stevens, 1897. Pp. viii, 230.)

MR. HENRY HARRISSE, after having done more than any man in his generation to reveal all that can be known of the process of the discovery

of the new world, has now turned his attention to the relations between the European powers that grew out of the discoveries. The "first chapter" of this diplomatic history is an examination of the papal concessions to Portugal in 1452 and later, of the Bulls of Alexander VI., 1493, and of the treaty of Tordesillas, 1494. There is also a brief account of the Badajos Junta, 1523-24, the detailed history of whose proceedings will constitute "chapter second" of his large design. The completeness, critical thoroughness, and sobriety of judgment with which Mr. Harrisse has treated these topics deserve the highest praise.

His narrative begins with the first Bull of Nicholas V., 1452, thus dismissing in silence the frequently mentioned Bull of Martin V., which the generally careful Muñoz apparently deduced from a passage in Barros, but of which no documentary trace has come down to us. The only Bull of Martin V. that has to do with the Portuguese conquests and that has come down to us is that of March 5, 1421, which provides for the organization of the new bishopric of Ceuta. Of the Bulls confirming that of Nicholas, issued in 1454, Mr. Harrisse remarks (p. 158) that he has not been able to find that of Calixtus III., which was mentioned by Juan and Ulloa. It is to be found in the collection, *Alguns Documentos do Archivo Nacional da Torre do Tombo acerca das Navegações e Conquistas Portuguezas*, Lisbon, 1892, pp. 20-22. For the treaty of 1479 between Spain and Portugal, in regard to their maritime possessions, he quotes a Portuguese manuscript copy in the Paris National Library. It may be of service to add that the Spanish text which was signed at Toledo, March 6, 1480, has been preserved in the Portuguese archives and is printed in the collection just mentioned, p. 42.

Mr. Harrisse can find no evidence that the placing of the demarcation line at a distance of one hundred leagues from the Azores and Cape Verde Islands was suggested by any outside influence, and is satisfied that the proposition came from the Pope's own advisers, who thought it best to leave the Portuguese a convenient and suitable margin of space in the ocean to the west of their possessions. In his translation of the passage in the Bull making this provision: "Quae linea distet a qualibet insularum, quae vulgariter nuncupantur de los Azores y Cabo Verde," Mr. Harrisse is certainly in error. He renders the last words "the Azores and Cape Verde," and remarks upon the difference in latitude and longitude between that cape and the Azores Islands. The correct translation is "the islands called in the vernacular the Azores and Cape Verde [Islands]." The use of the Spanish connective "y" shows that to justify Mr. Harrisse's rendering the text would have to read "de los Azores et a Cabo Verde." I am unable also to assent to the proposition that Alexander's Bull of Extension, September 25, 1493, superseded the Demarcation Bull. It did so only on the supposition that the Demarcation Bull was originally intended by the Pope to be extended round the globe. Of this there is no indication. The existence of the Antipodes is ignored in the Bull of May 4. What the Bull of September 25 did was to substitute for a possible extension of the line to the Antipodes the

principle of the priority of discovery. Of course this might, in effect, have deprived the Portuguese of any advantages from the Demarcation Bull if a Spanish explorer could have done immediately what was accomplished by Magellan's expedition. But that possibility was hardly contemplated. The Bull of September 25 reads as if it were intended merely to supplement that of May 4, not to abrogate it. Mr. Harrisse feels that there is some ground for suspecting the authenticity of this Bull of Extension, but, on the whole, he is inclined to accept it as genuine. That it was not invoked to defend the Spanish claims to the Moluccas is, perhaps, slightly unfavorable to its authenticity, but when that question arose everybody seemed to take for granted the extension of the Torde-sillas line to the other side of the world.

Those who are interested in the theoretical question as to where the Demarcation Line should have been drawn,—a problem quite beyond sixteenth-century science,—will find in the notes very careful calculations of the various questions according to methods devised by the author's friend, M. Bauvieux. Besides these mathematical discussions, the notes contain that wealth of bibliographical references which makes every student of Mr. Harrisse's books his grateful debtor. Many readers will be glad too for the apparently complete list of Mr. Harrisse's writings on the period of the discoveries.

EDWARD G. BOURNE.

L'Économie Sociale de la France sous Henri IV., 1589-1610. By GUSTAVE FAGNIEZ. (Paris: Hachette et Cie. 1897. Pp. 428.)

THIS is a history "with a purpose." The professed object of the writer is to show "in what manner a people is able to lift itself up from decadence, in what measure its own forces are sufficient for that purpose, and how far it has need for those of its government." Such an ulterior purpose might seem to leave but little room to expect a work of true historical investigation. Yet Mr. Fagniez has written a book which is scholarly, learned and unprejudiced to an unusual degree. The resolution of the paradox is to be found in the fact that he has chosen for his study a period in which the restoration of order after anarchy and the intelligent efforts of an active and benevolent king combined to bring a country from a condition of almost complete despair to a comparatively high state of prosperity. In writing of the economic history of the period of Henry IV. of France, the historian may very well give a plain and moderate account of the efforts made for settlement and improvement, and at the same time be preaching a vigorous sermon on the advantages of a benevolent despotism.

The book consists of four chapters, on rural economy, manufactures, and external and internal commerce, respectively. The starting-point in each of these fields is the same, the chaos resulting from the civil wars. If it is in the rural districts it is the persistent brigandage of the nobles, but half converted from their accustomed guerrilla warfare, and of bands of

soldiery whose support is not yet provided for under conditions of peace ; or, it is the cutting down of the forests, or the disproportionately small number of farm cattle due to the ravaging of the war, or the crushing taxation. If it is in the towns, it is the ruin left by successive sackings, the emigration of ruined artisans and the immigration of homeless peasants. If it is in the field of commerce, it is the same story ; roads overgrown and washed out and without bridges ; rivers whose navigation is obstructed almost equally by bars and shallows and by unauthorized dams and seigneurial tolls. The furrows of the war had been ploughed deep across every part of the field of French prosperity, and it was this condition of disintegration which gave all its conditions to the king's policy.

Alongside of these ravages of the war, it was, of course, necessary to describe the more normal elements in the social conditions and economic activity of France at the close of the sixteenth century ; the classes of the people, their legal and economic relations, some of the more influential institutions, and the prevailing occupations which gave support to the people and the government. These conditions, normal and abnormal, being given, the main task is to trace the work of the government in modifying them.

Much of the influence of government on social conditions was exerted indirectly through its efforts for the restoration of order. Every field of industry responded to the profound peace which France now enjoyed. Abuses which had grown up during the confusion of civil war might linger on, and act as an obstruction to the prosperity of certain localities or certain occupations, but after all society would conform itself to them ; they would become relatively less important ; and as a matter of fact were little by little absolutely removed by the efforts of government. A good instance of this process is to be found in the policy of the government in regard to the carrying of fire-arms. As a part of the abolition of unauthorized warfare this was prohibited entirely to all persons in 1598. But this action interfered with the hunting rights of the nobility ; it was modified by the liberal issue of dispensations, and in 1601 permission was given to landowners to carry fire-arms for hunting on their own estates. Old habits, however, were too strong, and gentlemen took advantage of this new permission to settle personal and party quarrels violently and thus disturb the general security and order. Therefore in 1603 the use of fire-arms was again altogether forbidden. But by the next year habits of peace were presumed to be so far restored that the old liberty of using guns in private hunting was granted, and apparently without any subsequent ill-effects ; though the retention by the government of the monopoly of the manufacture and sale of all warlike weapons and of powder probably did its part to prevent outbreaks on a large scale.

But the greater part of M. Fagniez's work is devoted to a study of the more direct efforts of Henry to bring about greater prosperity by the creation of new industries or new conditions for the working of the old industries. The number of objects for which such efforts were made is remarkable. They are in every field. In law they range from the con-

ferring of commercial capacity on minors engaged in trade to the creation of "consular jurisdictions" for the settlement of disputes between merchants on commercial questions. Early in his reign he granted concessions and made regulations for the drainage of marshes and swamps throughout the kingdom; this remained a subject of constant effort, and his plans were just being crowned with some degree of success at the time of his death. He devoted years of interest and effort to the introduction of the silk-worm, the production of silk thread and of silk fabrics. He spent the value of many millions of francs on the repair of roads, bridges and canals, and induced local authorities to expend perhaps as much more. He patronized a great commercial expedition formed in 1604 to trade with the East Indies, besides many other schemes of trading and colonial expansion. He negotiated with all other European rulers, from James I. of England to the Barbary pirates, in favor of trade. Scores of projects for agricultural, industrial, commercial, or legal novelties were presented to him or initiated by him. In fact, no scheme that promised any kind of economic development, no proposition for a modification of the law that would facilitate trade, give security to finance, or freedom to men's economic activity, failed to obtain from Henry interest or consideration, and in many cases support. "Reduction of the *taille*, remission of arrears of taxes, liberty of local export of grain, exemption of the farm live stock and agricultural implements from seizure for taxes, opportunity for the parishes to regain their common lands, establishment of relays where farmers should be able to obtain horses, drainage of the marshes, reform of the administration of the forests—this is what agriculture owed to him." And there is some such account for each of the other great industrial fields.

Many of these plans were fruitless. The long-continued and expensive effort to introduce the culture of the silk-worm, for instance, seems to have been practically without result. The same is true of many of the projects for new manufactures. Again much of his policy was vacillating, as, for instance, his treatment of the trade corporations and guilds. And again some of it, especially in financial lines, was distinctly reactionary. Yet, as M. Fagniez says, one must nevertheless admire "his openness of mind, his ready comprehension of new matters, his confidence in the success of new enterprises, his perseverance in sustaining them, his attention to economy combined with the taste for grandeur, his application to the development of all the resources of his kingdom, which has been well compared to that of a proprietor in increasing the value of his estate." And coming back to the main thesis of his book the author closes by saying: "The economic renaissance of which the last years of the reign were a witness, France owed, no doubt, largely to herself, but she owed them still more to her government. Such a study as we have made does not, therefore, give support to the doctrine of fatalism, which now finds so much favor, nor to the scarcely less popular teaching that governments have but little influence and therefore but little importance. It teaches us, on the contrary, for our

consolation and our hope, that a people, through the force of its energy, may climb again the slope of decadence ; and that nothing can aid it more than an authority which is strong and respected, passionately devoted to the public interest, imposing respect upon individual interests, opening new avenues for national activity, stimulating its hesitations, and sustaining its weaknesses."

It remains to say that Sully drops into an unwonted unimportance in this study ; that the author shows manufactures and commerce, as compared with agriculture, to have obtained a much greater attention than is generally taught ; and, finally, that the position of France in Europe is stated with a modesty quite unusual for a French author. The book has a good analytical index. In fact, our principal criticism, and that is perhaps a somewhat impertinent one, is that the size of the book, its weight, its broad margins, and luxuriousness of paper and print seem somewhat disproportioned to the plain subject and style of the work.

EDWARD P. CHEYNEY.

Beiträge zur Geschichte der politischen Ideen und der Regierungspraxis. VON GOTTFRIED KOCH. I. Absolutismus und Parlamentarismus ; II. Demokratie und Constitution. (Berlin : R. Gärtner. 1892, 1896. Two vols., pp. viii, 184 ; viii, 242.)

THE work before us, so far as yet published, deals only with England and France and covers the period between the reign of Louis XIV. and the beginning of the French Revolution. The book is a history not only of political ideas but also of political institutions, including under the latter term administrative machinery and practice. The author's plan includes not only political theories, but also the political facts of which they are the reflection or against which they are a protest. The first two chapters, dealing with the period of Louis XIV., may serve as a sample of the author's method. The first chapter, thirteen pages in length, is an examination of the theory of the absolute monarchy as it is laid down in contemporary writers, foremost among them Bossuet. Then follows a chapter forty pages long, entitled "Art der Regierung Louis XIV." The topics treated of in this chapter embrace the central government, including the several councils of the crown, the organization of provinces, districts and municipalities, judicial administration, police and taxation. Among the topics named some are treated in considerable detail. Under the head of justice, for example, not only are the parliaments described, but an account is also given of courts of inferior jurisdiction. It is evident that the treatment of these topics within such narrow compass must necessarily be very brief, so much so indeed as sometimes to raise the question whether there ought not to be either more or nothing. It is to be said, however, on the other hand that the information is accurate and that its presentation in this form will be a great convenience, especially to those who are limited either in time or in sources of information. Indeed the author has read widely and to the point, so that his pages often contain information which otherwise it would not be easy to find.

Keeping in mind the subordinate title of Part I., *Absolutismus und Parlamentarismus*, we understand why the author, after having dealt with absolute monarchy in France, turns to England to study the beginnings of parliamentary government. To this subject two chapters are devoted, one giving an account of the struggle between the Stuart kings and Parliament, the other dealing with the same struggle in the realm of political theory. From England the author again turns to France to make in the two following chapters a study of the incipient reaction against absolute monarchy as seen in the writers of the period and in the political struggles of the Regency. Characteristic is the detailed account of the struggle between the Regent and the Parliament of Paris and of Law's financial scheme. The remaining four chapters of the first part deal with England under Walpole and France under Fleury, an extended account being given of the political philosophy of Bolingbroke and of Montesquieu.

The first three chapters of the second part deal with France under Louis XV., the first describing the struggles between him and the parliaments, the second expounding the constitution of France according to the view of the parliaments, and the third treating of Rousseau as the founder of democracy. It will be seen that the author is true to his method of studying political ideas in connection with the soil in which they germinate. The five following chapters are given to England and its American colonies, the study of the democratic transformation which English institutions had undergone in the new world preparing the way for the three closing chapters dealing with France under Louis XVI., political ideas in France before the Revolution and the Constitution of 1791. A third part, now in preparation, is to trace the constitutional development of England and France down to 1848, while in a fourth part the author proposes to deal with Germany as he has already dealt with England and France, and to bring the constitutional development of the three countries down to the present day.

The book before us has sterling merit. It is painstaking and thorough, and its pages are packed with information. The method of studying political theories together with the political situation in which they are developed and the political facts for which they stand is attractive. The plan makes it necessary that a large number of subjects should be treated in brief space, but subject to this limitation the author has given us a useful book.

RICHARD HUDSON.

Histoire Générale du IV^e Siècle à nos Jours. Publiée sous la direction de MM. ERNEST LAVISSE et ALFRED RAMBAUD. Tome VIII. La Révolution Française (1789-1799). (Paris: Armand Colin et Cie. 1896. Pp. 992.)

Études et Leçons sur la Révolution Française. Par F. A. AULARD. Seconde Série. (Paris: Félix Alcan. 1898. Pp. 308.)

M. F. A. AULARD is incontestably the greatest living authority upon the history of the French Revolution. He has done more than any

other scholar to treat the period from a strictly scientific and historic point of view, and he may be regarded as typical of the group of students, who are now laboring to discover the true sequence of facts during the most dramatic period of French history. For three generations the French Revolution has served as the chief issue in French politics. Its history has been written with the purpose in view of accrediting or condemning French political parties and the ascertaining of the truth has been regarded as of comparatively little importance. The Revolution to Frenchmen and, indeed, to all Europeans, is the starting point for the discussion of modern politics, and it is not until quite recently that the touchstones of modern historical science have been tried for the purpose of acquiring a knowledge of its events as they really happened. Now old legends are being cleared away and the history of the French Revolution is being examined as critically and as impartially as the history of the Middle Ages. M. Aulard is the recognized chief of this movement. Although frankly an admirer of the Revolution, regarding it as the period in which all that is noblest in modern France has its rise, he is yet a real scholar and does not allow his enthusiasm to warp the candor of his mind. As Professor of the History of the French Revolution at the Sorbonne, as secretary of the Société de la Révolution Française and editor of its monthly review and other publications, M. Aulard has done yeoman service in bringing into existence a sane, historical standpoint for the study of revolutionary history. He has not undertaken, like the rhapsodists of the last generation, like Carlyle and Michelet, to write a long and elaborate history of the period, but has deliberately preferred to confine himself mainly to the editing of documents of prime importance. It is not too much to say that M. Aulard by his editions of the Register of the Committee of Public Safety and of the Proceedings of the Jacobin Club has for the first time made it possible for students to understand the nature and events of the Reign of Terror and the history of the famous club which did so much to mould public opinion in revolutionary France. He has been too much occupied with teaching, reviewing, and editing to undertake the writing of a secondary history on a large scale, though his monographs on the Orators of the Revolution and on the Worship of Reason clearly prove his ability to accomplish that much needed work, the writing of a real history of the French Revolution based on facts and not on fancies.

The nearest thing to a consecutive history of the French Revolution that M. Aulard has permitted himself is the contribution of four chapters on the Constituent Assembly, the Legislative Assembly, the internal history of the National Convention and the internal history of the Directory, to the great *Histoire Générale* of MM. Lavis and Rambaud, now in course of publication. It is not too much to say that these four chapters form the best brief account of the French Revolution, based on modern authorities, and treated with critical skill by a master of his subject, in the French language. M. Edme Champion, who contributed the first chapter of the Revolutionary volume of the *Histoire Générale*, a chapter

on the cahiers, has worked up his researches for this chapter into a volume, and it is to be hoped that M. Aulard, now that he has his skeleton in print, may follow the example of his colleague. The words just used are those of high praise and may seem exaggerated, but the fact remains that the labors of M. Aulard himself have made so thoroughly out of date all previous volumes upon the Revolution that such a book as he alone can write is urgently called for. It is especially fortunate that the scheme of the *Histoire Générale* provides for the appending of lists of primary authorities and important secondary works to each chapter, so that M. Aulard's great bibliographical knowledge of his subject has been used to advantage.

To the historical scholar, M. Aulard's chapters form the chief attraction of the volume of the *Histoire Générale* that contains them, but it would be unfair not to say a few words about the work of other contributors. M. Vast, following the authoritative work of M. Albert Sorel, has written an able chapter on the war between France and Europe from 1792 to 1795, and in collaboration with M. Rambaud, the same author has treated the wars of the Directory. Chapters of varying value are contributed by different less-known authorities on the legislative work of the Revolution, on the Church, on education, on literature, on art, and on political economy in France during the period. The Revolution is so distinctly the central feature of the decade, that the history of other countries takes a smaller place than in the previous volumes of the great history, but special reference should be made to M. Rambaud's excellent chapter on Eastern Europe to 1796, and to M. Pingaud's brief chapter on Italy and M. de Crue's still briefer chapter on Switzerland. The chapter on England is, as in the previous volumes, quite inadequate, as can be seen by a glance at the very poor bibliography of works consulted appended to it. M. Moireau is a little more thorough in his chapter on America from 1781 to 1799, in which he devotes forty-five pages to the formation of the Federal government and its early policy.

So much has been said of the excellence of M. Aulard's work in the *Histoire Générale* that it is perhaps appropriate here to draw attention to the second series of *Études et Leçons sur la Révolution Française* which he has just published. This little volume contains seven articles which have appeared in various periodicals and a lecture upon Auguste Comte and the French Revolution. The lecture is particularly interesting; it is a refutation of the ridiculous theory of Comte that there were during the Revolution three distinct schools of disciples of Voltaire, of Diderot and of Rousseau. This was one of the pet theories of the Positivist teacher, who loved to twist history to suit his imagination, and it is to be feared that its influence has extended outside of Positivist circles and has given a false color to the distinction between the politicians of the Revolutionary period. It may be admitted that Robespierre was a fervent disciple of Rousseau, but the attempt of Comte to glorify Danton by making him an obedient echo of the supposed political theories of Diderot instead of considering him as a great patriotic opportunist, is demonstrably false.

Of the reprinted articles, the most noteworthy for the historian are M. Aulard's skillful studies of the causes and the sequel of the *coup d'état* of 18 Brumaire. It was hardly necessary for him to reprint his article on the authenticity of the so-called Memoirs of Talleyrand, for all scholars are aware, thanks to him and M. Flammermont, of the exact amount of credit they deserve.

H. MORSE STEPHENS.

Mémoires et Notes de Choudieu (1761-1838). Publiés d'après les papiers de l'auteur avec une préface et des remarques par VICTOR BARRUCAND. (Paris: E. Plon, Nourrit et Cie. 1897. Pp. xv, 484.)

M. VICTOR BARRUCAND has done good service to students of the history of the French Revolution in publishing the memoirs of Choudieu. The existence of Choudieu's papers in the public library of Angers has long been known; a selection from them was published in the *Revue de la Révolution* some years ago; and their present editor made considerable use of them in his valuable book on Rossignol. It is, however, a great advantage to have collected together in a handy volume everything from Choudieu's pen of real historical value. M. Barrucand explains in his preface that the papers which he has worked up are rather notes for an autobiography with scattered criticisms on other works than memoirs in the true sense of the word. Undoubtedly Choudieu at one time intended to write a complete autobiography, but the work was never finished, and the notes and papers now published are rather materials for memoirs than a consecutive account of the events in which Choudieu played a part.

Pierre Choudieu is one of the striking figures in the Reign of Terror. He was never a great political leader or an important statesman, but he was one of the valiant deputies to the National Convention sent forth, in the days of the greatest peril to France, to organize the armies of the Republic and to lead them to victory. Born at Angers, of a legal family, in 1761, Choudieu was educated at the military school at Metz, and became an officer in the artillery. He was speedily disgusted by the contempt shown in the army to those officers who were not of noble birth, and, abandoning the military profession, he entered the magistracy of his native city, and became one of the King's advocates there. The early years of the Revolution found him an enthusiastic adherent of the new ideas, and in 1791 he was elected by the department of the Maine-et-Loire to the Legislative Assembly. As a deputy, he associated with the party of the extreme Left, and won for himself some little reputation, especially as a member of the Military Committee. The earliest notes published by M. Barrucand have reference to the opening of Choudieu's career. His account of the revolutionary influences in Angers and of his military and legal experiences is interesting, but his notes upon the

Legislative Assembly are of greater value. His remarks, for instance, on the events of June 20 and of August 10, 1792, and on the massacres of September in the prisons of Paris, are of real importance. It is true that they were written in extreme old age and often take the shape of criticisms upon works upon the Revolution written under the Restoration, but they must be consulted by future historians and cannot safely be neglected in examining the events to which they relate. In 1792 Choudieu was elected to the National Convention, and about eighty pages of his notes are devoted to a somewhat fragmentary examination of the issues that arose between the Girondins and the Mountain during the early months of the Republic, and to anecdotes about the King's trial. In March, 1793, Choudieu was sent as a Deputy on Mission to the western departments, where the insurrection in La Vendée rapidly developed, and until the end of the Terror he remained on mission, first taking part in the operations for the conquest of the Vendéans, and later accompanying the triumphant advance of the Army of the North into Belgium in the summer of 1794. Choudieu not only directed the movements of generals and carried on a voluminous correspondence with the Committee of Public Safety, but also served in the field and was twice wounded in battles with the Vendean insurgents. As has already been said, Choudieu's fame rests upon his conduct during this period. He was the chief of the so-called "Court of Saumur," and his methods and those of his colleagues for the subjugation of the Vendean insurrection were vigorously attacked at the time and have been severely criticised by historians. This is not the place to examine the controversy between Philippeaux and Choudieu. It is enough to say that there is much to be said on both sides, and that sympathy for the death of Philippeaux upon the guillotine ought not to prevent justice from being done to the point of view of his chief opponent. The position of Choudieu is well known from the elaborate report which he drew up with his colleague, Richard, at the time, but a good deal of matter of great supplementary interest, amounting to about one hundred pages, is now printed by M. Barrucand from Choudieu's rather fragmentary notes. He seems to have preserved nothing with regard to his later mission with the conquering army in Belgium, and the latter part of his memoirs is filled with an account of the Thermidorian reaction, of which he was himself one of the victims. On 12 Germinal Year III. (April 1, 1795) he was ordered under arrest and was not released until the general amnesty which was declared at the time of the dissolution of the Convention. The later life of Choudieu was uneventful. He was for a short time employed in the War Department during the Directory, but as a sturdy Republican was regarded with disfavor by Napoleon, and spent the years of the Consulate and the Empire as an exile in Holland. In 1814 he returned to France, and in the following year had a moment of importance in endeavoring to rouse France against the Allies after the return of Napoleon from Elbe. This conduct led to further exile, and from 1815 to 1830 he lived in poverty at Brussels with other proscribed regicides. The Revolution of 1830

opened the way for the return of the old Republican, who died in Paris in 1838. Of the long years of exile, Choudieu's notes tell next to nothing. Though he lived to be 77 years old, his political career closed with his arrest in 1795. Brief as that career was, the name of Choudieu lives as that of one of the most vigorous of the saviours of France during the time of national enthusiasm, which is designated the Reign of Terror, and M. Barrucand deserves hearty thanks for making his notes and memoirs generally accessible.

H. MORSE STEPHENS.

Mémoires du Comte Ferrand. Publiés pour la Société d'Histoire Contemporaine par le Vicomte de Broc. (Paris: Alphonse Picard et Fils. 1897. Pp. xvi, 313.)

THE Société d'Histoire Contemporaine has, since its foundation in 1892, published many most interesting volumes, some of memoirs, others of hitherto unedited documents, and others of letters. Its editors have invariably been scholars of modern training, who have dealt with their materials with reverent care and have not allowed their political prejudices to interfere with their scientific honesty. Among these editors may be noted such distinguished students of Revolutionary history as MM. de la Rocheterie, Léonce Pingaud, Victor Pierre and the Marquis de Beaucourt, and to them has now been added, for the first time, the Vicomte de Broc, who has already made his reputation by his work on France under the *ancien régime*. All these editors belong to what may be called the royalist and ecclesiastical party in the study of the history of the French Revolution. Up to the death of the Comte de Chambord this party was represented by the *Revue de la Révolution*, which was devoted to the publication of articles and documents bearing adversely upon the men and events of the Revolution. When the *Revue* unfortunately came to an end the Société de l'Histoire Contemporaine was founded. The society has the advantage of being able to draw upon the family archives of distinguished conservative actors during the Revolution, and it has thus been able to illustrate many sides of the Revolution that are apt to be neglected by its admirers. It must be admitted to the credit of the editors who have been mentioned that they never allow their prejudices to mutilate their documents, although they express their opinions freely in their introductions. The last volume published by the society contains the memoirs of Comte Ferrand. It is hardly so interesting as some of its predecessors. Ferrand was born in 1751 of a parliamentary family, and, at the age of eighteen, became one of the judges of the Parlement of Paris. His memoirs give a brief but vivid account of the parliamentary troubles which preceded the convocation of the States-General in 1789. Ferrand was a vehement royalist, and left France with the first emigration in September, 1789, to become the political adviser of the Prince de Condé. He spent about ten years in exile, taking an active part in the politics of the émigrés, and writing various

royalist pamphlets and popular works on history. During the Consulate and the Empire Ferrand lived in absolute retirement in France, but the Restoration drew him from his obscurity, and he was in 1814 created a count, made a member of the Académie Française, and appointed director of the French post-office. The greater part of his memoirs deals with the early governments of Louis XVIII., and throws considerable light upon the internal history of this period. His account of the drawing up of the Charter of 1814 is of prime authority, and his chapter on the difficulties which beset Louis XVIII. during the first days of the Restoration is brief but important. He was acting Minister of the Marine when Napoleon left Elba, and his narrative of the Hundred Days throws a new light upon that period. From 1815 to 1823 Ferrand was in a position which enabled him to follow the work of the administration, and nothing of more primary importance for this period has been published within recent years. It only remains to be said that the Vicomte de Broc has done his work admirably and that he has appended the valuable little biographical foot-notes which are always to be found in modern editions of French historical memoirs with profusion and accuracy.

H. MORSE STEPHENS.

The Campaign of Marengo, with Comments. By HERBERT H. SARGENT, First Lieutenant and Quartermaster, Second Cavalry, United States Army. (Chicago: A. C. McClurg and Co. 1897. Pp. 240.)

In 1800 Napoleon was thirty, within two years as old as Alexander at his death. He had won his rank as a strategist and tactician in 1796; he had deservedly made himself First Consul. Mainly by his efforts civil war had been suppressed; France had been saved from financial ruin; the morale of the nation and the army had been restored. Napoleon had deserved well in that he had not despaired of the republic.

Peace was desired; but events were set for war. England commanded the sea, but remained inactive. Austria held all northern Italy with 120,000 men under brave but aged Melas, confronted in the Genoa region by tenacious Masséna with one-third the force; while on either side of the Rhine stood Kray and Moreau, each with an army of about 125,000 men.

Napoleon, in supreme command, was secretly raising an Army of Reserve. Assembled near Geneva, it could succor either Masséna or Moreau. Austria was attacking on two lines separated by the Alps, while France might debouch from central Switzerland against either of her armies. The best Austrian soldier, the Archduke Charles, had been shelved, and the Aulic Council assiduously kept both Kray and Melas misinformed. The Army of Reserve was assembled without their knowledge. Kray and Melas believed that every French soldier stood in their front. From Paris Napoleon watched each move, understood the meaning of every

situation. No man has comprehended the great game of war in the same broad and yet detailed sense. Lesser lights have since jeered at Napoleon's pincushion maps, and at Jomini's diagrams; but the man who, for his own instruction or another's, can so give a clear object lesson, proves that he has mastered his subject. The captain must think clearly before he can act clearly.

Masséna's duty in the general scheme was to occupy the attention of Melas; and he was abreast of the task. Though literally starved out of Genoa, he contained his thrice greater opponent until Napoleon could descend upon his rear. Though able, Moreau lacked his chief's audacity, and rejected Napoleon's bold manœuvre, by which he might turn Kray out of his position and compromise his army. But rank and file confided in Moreau; Napoleon needed the man, and he was permitted to play his own game. This he did respectably, not brilliantly. He might have destroyed Kray; he did actually defeat him.

Meanwhile Napoleon assembled his Army of Reserve, 55,000 strong, and crossed the Alps. This march he and his adulators have been fond of likening to Hannibal's daring feat. It was in no sense comparable to that wonderful performance, nor indeed to the march of Alexander across the Hindu Kush. But it was splendid in execution as in conception, utterly unexpected by the enemy, and successful. By the 25th of May, despite the almost fatal check at Bard, his five corps had descended into the valley of the Po. He was within reach of the communications of Melas; his own were secure.

The pass of Stradella, where the Apennines meet the Po, has always played its part, as all great topographical features must, in the campaigns of northern Italy. Hannibal calculated on it; Prince Eugene won Turin because of it; Napoleon saw that it was the gate through which Melas must retreat. Hastening to Milan, after a diversion leading Melas to believe he was aiming at Turin, Napoleon was compelled to await his reinforcements; but he reached Stradella and camped there on the 6th of June, astride the line of retreat of Melas, who had just awakened to the meaning of the problem. Melas had not drawn diagrams, mentally or otherwise.

The strategy of the campaign of Marengo was magnificent; that leading up to the battle and the tactics of the battle itself were full of audacity, but lacking in discretion. Purposing a battle near Stradella, Napoleon failed to concentrate all his forces there, lest Melas should escape by the north of the Po; he advanced to Marengo without sufficiently reconnoitring, detached Dessaix, and was outnumbered and surprised on the battle-field. Had not Melas's personal exhaustion prevented continuance of the handsome effort which defeated the French in the forenoon; had not Dessaix marched back to the sound of the guns; had not Napoleon been fortunate in his lieutenants—had he indeed not been Napoleon—Marengo would have been a lost battle. His manœuvre was perfect up to Stradella; he then gambled on the chances; and any one but Napoleon would have miscarried.

All this is told by Lieutenant Sargent in an interesting and especially perspicuous manner. What may be called the modern military criticism, *i. e.*, that which the reader may compare to modern examples, often within his own experience, dates only from the present generation. Jomini, though we all go back to him with a keener sense of enlightenment, appeals rather to the soldier than to the civilian; but out of the modern critic's book any intelligent reader may, without effort, grasp the salient points of a military situation. Turgid criticism preceding Lloyd arose from turgid ideas. Lloyd was the first to see and tell why Frederick accomplished his astounding results. Jomini's diagrams first enunciated what Napoleon had evolved from the deeds of his predecessors—the modern art of war. Since Jomini, military criticism has grown to appeal more directly to the civilian. Just as nowadays a layman may better understand the law applicable to his own peculiar case than in the days of Coke, so may he better comprehend the underlying motives of this or that manœuvre on a strategic or tactical field, than a century ago.

Lieutenant Sargent is one of the most interesting of our modern military critics; and, recognizing that no single chapter can do a campaign justice, he is happy in choosing to devote each of his volumes to a single campaign.

Marengo has been so fully discussed heretofore that it is no detraction from this work to say that there is perhaps small room for novel ideas upon the subject; but the author's presentation of the events which led up to the battle and of the battle itself shows a good sense of proportion, keen appreciation of the value of facts, and an agreeable, easy style. Future volumes will be warmly welcomed.

THEODORE AYRAULT DODGE.

The Life of Francis Place; 1771-1854. By GRAHAM WALLAS, M.A.
(New York, London and Bombay: Longmans, Green and Co.
1898. Pp. x, 415.)

THE special value of Mr. Wallas's *Life of Francis Place* is at once obvious to students of English constitutional and party history of the period between the French Revolution and the abolition of the Corn Laws. Biographies and volumes of memoirs and letters coming within these sixty years have been published in large numbers during the last twenty-five years. First-hand material of this kind has been constantly growing in volume; but up to the present time there has been no authoritative book covering that part of the movement for constitutional reform with which Francis Place was so conspicuously identified. Place was never of the House of Commons. Although he began life as a working tailor, quite early in his career he had a shop of his own, and was exceedingly prosperous. In the days of the unreformed Parliament, it would have been easy for a man of his wealth to have bought a seat in the House of Commons, as was done by Hume, Ricardo, Romilly and other men who were on the popular side in the Reform movement. Place never availed himself of this opportunity; yet no man, in or out of Parliament,

was more actively concerned in politics than he. His life was largely given up to politics. It was exclusively so from about his forty-sixth year. He was associated with the movement for the repeal of the Combination Laws; from 1807 to 1832 with the movement for the first Reform Bill; later on with the movements for poor-law reform and municipal reform; with the Chartist agitation; with the movement for the repeal of the taxes on newspapers; and finally with the agitation for the repeal of the Corn Laws.

In all these movements, Place was active as an organizer; often as a lobbyist; and continuously as an advocate of reform in any newspaper whose editor would print his letters. New light is thrown by Mr. Wallas's book on the agitation for the repeal of the Combination Laws, and also on the beginnings of the system of elementary education in England; for among his numerous activities, Place took a foremost part in the establishment of the British and Foreign Schools Society, an institution which still exists, and which between 1808 and the Forster Education Act of 1870 did so much good work in promoting unsectarian elementary education. But more than all, Mr. Wallas's book is valuable for that part of it that covers the closing days of the long movement for the first Parliamentary Reform Act. It would have been welcome to students if only for these two chapters. For some years past, there has been no lack of information concerning the ministerial and Parliamentary aspects of the closing year of an agitation for Reform which can be traced back to the time of the Tudors—concerning the fortunes of the struggle, after the first Reform Bill had been introduced by Lord John Russell, had passed the House of Commons, and had been rejected by the House of Lords. The Whig and official side can be traced in detail in Le Marchant's *Life of Althorp*; in Walpole's *Life of Lord John Russell*; in Brougham's *Correspondence*; and from day to day, almost from hour to hour, in Earl Grey's *Correspondence with Princess Lieven*. The Tory side is to be found in Jennings's *Memoirs and Correspondence of Croker*, and in the *Wellington Civil Correspondence*. The part played by William IV. can be followed in his *Letters to Earl Grey*. The demagogic side of the struggle from the beginning of the century is told in Huish's *Life of Hunt* and in the *Memoirs of Cartwright*. But hitherto there has been a lack of first-hand information as to what was doing in the constituencies, especially as to what was doing in London, during the period of tension and crisis which intervened from the 1st of March, 1831, when Lord John Russell introduced his bill, until the second Reform bill was accepted by the House of Lords on June 4, 1832.

The *Life of Place* fills this gap, and forms as important a contribution to the literature of the great constitutional crisis as Grey's *Letters to Princess Lieven*, or the *Letters of William IV. to Grey*. It is not possible here to recall, however briefly, the events of that critical period. But it may be stated that Place's story of them brings out two important facts, more or less new. It shows in the first place how greatly and how pleasantly the extent of the reform proposed in Lord John Russell's bill sur-

prised Place, and the cooler heads among the reformers out of Parliament—how greatly it surprised those who, while actively and energetically on the popular side, had no sympathy with Hunt, and with the reception which Hunt gave to the bill in the House of Commons. Place obtained his first news of the bill from a reporter of the *Morning Chronicle*. "It was so very much beyond anything that I had expected," he wrote, "that had it been told me by a person unused to proceedings in the House, I should have supposed that he had made a mistake." In the second place, the narrative quoted by Mr. Wallas from Place's papers show how perilously near to revolution England came, after Earl Grey had resigned. Place's story leaves the impression that had the Duke of Wellington taken office, there must inevitably have been collisions between the troops and the people.

From a student's point of view, Mr. Wallas has handled admirably the enormous mass of material at his disposal. Wherever possible he has allowed Place to tell his own story, and very largely he leaves it to the reader to form his own estimate of Place, and the singularly important, though unobtrusive part Place played in the history of English politics in the first half of the nineteenth century.

EDWARD PORRITT.

Kaiser Wilhelm I. VON ERICH MARCKS. (Leipzig: Duncker und Humblot. 1897. Pp. xiii, 370.)

If a historical biography is to be anything more than a mechanical mixture of biography and history, the biographer must of course establish the causal nexus between his hero and the times in which the hero figured. Marcks attacks this problem upon both its sides: he considers not only the influence which William exercised upon his times, but also the influence which the times exercised upon William. In studying his hero's character he not only utilizes the direct testimony of those who knew the prince, the king, the emperor; he also considers the formative forces of heredity, tradition and environment, and endeavors to trace the modifying influences exercised by persons and by events. In his attempt to determine William's share in events, he is not content to say that the king rendered such a decision or gave such a command; he tries to show who or what made the king act in that particular way. At every critical juncture he endeavors to get inside of William's mind and find out what was going on there. Where the evidence is inconclusive and where there is no evidence, he falls back upon inferences from character. The historical and the biographical elements in the book are thus connected by a double bond: history is employed to account for William's character and explain its development, and the biographic result—the complete picture of William's views, sentiments and aspirations—is used to throw new light upon the history of his reign.

In its central purpose the book is a study in psychology, and to this purpose the history of the times and the story of the visible life are both sub-

ordinated. Allusion to well-known events frequently takes the place of narration; facts are set forth in detail only where the writer seeks to place upon them a new interpretation. The book differs from the ordinary biography very much as the novels of James and of Bourget differ from the novel of action; and, like these, it gives something of the impression of a new *genre*.

Written originally for the voluminous *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, Marcks's sketch was of course intended for what the Germans call "the cultured public." From the majority of the German popular works that deal with the founders of the new empire it differs, however, not only in method but in spirit. It is remarkably fair and frank. Marcks is a monarchist and a nationalist; to his approval of the achievements of William's reign he adds warm admiration for William's character; but he does not hesitate to define to himself and to his readers the grounds and the limits of his admiration. He recognizes the defects as well as the merits of the man; he notes the mistakes as well as the triumphs of the ruler. It is, he declares, "a false piety that desires to conceal . . . the reverse side of brilliant times" (p. 294.)

William's father, Frederick William III., was an honest, well-meaning, conscientious, industrious, dull man, who found it very difficult to make up his mind on any matter of consequence—possibly because he had so little mind to make up. Queen Louise was his superior, both in intellect and in character. From these parents William and his elder brother, afterwards Frederick William IV., derived an unequal inheritance. The crown-prince had all his mother's quickness of intellect and all his father's weakness of will. William had all his father's best qualities, something of his mother's intelligence, and all her strength of purpose.

On these two natures tradition and environment exercised a very different influence. William, Marcks insists, was before all things *altpreussisch*. His faith was naïve, dogmatic Protestantism of the old school. His intellectual point of view was that of the rationalistic eighteenth century. His aspirations were for the aggrandizement of Prussia through successful war. As a boy he witnessed Prussia's deepest abasement; its reorganization by the efforts of Stein, Scharnhorst and their associates; its re-establishment by the War of Liberation. He was too young, as Marcks observes, to understand or be strongly influenced by the social reforms of Stein; the reaction in his mind was rather against French revolutionary tendencies than against the older Prussian institutions.

The forces which worked most strongly upon the mind of the crown-prince were of quite another sort. They were furnished by that great reaction against eighteenth-century rationalism which begot mysticism in religion and clericalism in the churches; which expressed itself in literature as romanticism; and which in the field of politics and law produced the historical school. The older brother, with his more alert and more receptive mind and his weaker character, was swept off his feet by this current of feeling and opinion. His conception of church and state became and remained medieval. On William's "leathery nature"—to quote

his own phrase, used in a different connection (p. 85)—this movement exercised no visible influence.

To all this it should be added that during the father's long reign Prince William's activity was restricted to the army. The crown-prince was educated to be king; William to be a general. In military matters he became an expert. In politics, European, German, and Prussian, his views, at the age of forty-three, were not those of a statesman, but those of a Prussian officer.

In 1840, when his brother became king, William's position was changed. Frederick William IV. was childless, and William was recognized as "Prince of Prussia." He became president of the ministry and of the council of state; he was made governor of Pomerania; and during the king's foreign journeys he was more than once charged with the conduct of the general affairs of the kingdom. After 1850, however, the differences of opinion between the brothers in matters both of foreign and of domestic policy became so marked that William drew back again into purely military life. In matters domestic, William objected to the sacrifice of the powers of the crown. He objected to the tolerably harmless United Diet of 1847; he objected much more strongly to the concessions made in the following year to armed revolutionists. He felt, nevertheless, that the king, having granted a representative constitution, should live up to it, and he held himself wholly aloof from the Tory reaction of 1850-57. It was in German affairs, however, that his opposition to the king and the Tories was most pronounced. The movements of 1848-50 in the direction of German unity under Prussian leadership appealed strongly to his ambition; and the abandonment of the narrower union on the Erfurt plan, the sacrifice of Prussian and German interests in the Hessian and Schleswig-Holstein questions—in one word, Olmütz—drove him into an attitude which to the court, and to wider circles as well, appeared "liberal."

All this goes far to explain why, on becoming regent (1858), William gave the ministry a more liberal complexion. His general course of action, however, during the next two years seems to have been determined not by liberalism, but by the sobering influences of power and of advancing age and by instincts of loyalty and generosity. The soldier longing for battle, the *Altpreuße* bent on the aggrandizement of his state, the hereditary enemy of Austria as the chief opponent of Prussia's greatness—for a time all these disappeared. Bismarck, because of his pronounced antagonism to Austria, was transferred from Frankfort to St. Petersburg—"put on ice," as he himself expressed it, "on the Neva." When the Italian war broke out, William refused to take advantage of Austria's straits. He mobilized the Prussian army in order to come to Austria's aid, and would undoubtedly have fought for her had not Austria refused to trust Prussia with the command of the federal army and patched up a hasty peace with France. During the same year, he urged a reform of the federal army, advocating a plan which would have given Austria the control of all South Germany. It is a singular chapter of Prussian

history, which the reviewer has nowhere seen so frankly written. In December, 1861, William's Liberal premier, Prince Hohenzollern, declared to a friend that he himself was not the man for the place; that what the king needed was "an iron character, who should ruthlessly ignore or hold in check the noble sides of his [the king's] character and aim solely at the good of the state" (p. 185).

In one thing only was William *altpreussisch* during these years: in his determination to reorganize the Prussian army. The effort brought him into conflict with the Prussian Diet, necessitated a change of ministry and, in the autumn of 1862, brought Bismarck into the cabinet as prime minister. In court and official circles Bismarck had long been recognized as "ministerial timber." Sybel¹ tells us that in March, 1858, William had decided to call Bismarck into the ministry, and that this plan was abandoned only because of the sudden death of the proposed prime minister, Alvensleben. Marcks (p. 191) rejects this "tradition." He asserts that even in 1862 the king shrank from Bismarck's appointment. The obstacle, he says, was personal—"eine ganz ausgeprägte Abneigung des Königs." The king's dislike was partly due to Bismarck's extreme frankness and frequent brusqueness of speech: in 1858 Bismarck himself had assured Gerlach that he would not suit the prince, "who must be handled gently." In the king's dislike there was also an element of distrust: Bismarck, to use his own phrase again, had a reputation for "*leichtfertige Gewaltthätigkeit*." At bottom it was perhaps, as Marcks suggests, the element of genius, "*das Dämonische*," in Bismarck that repelled "the son of Frederick William III."

Bismarck was called to the premiership because he was quite willing to fight the Diet, and because he convinced the king that the conflict could be maintained on constitutional lines. He was not selected to solve the German question. William himself believed that Prussia would some day unite and rule Germany, but he had no expectation that he would live to see that day. In making Bismarck premier, he certainly had no intention of abandoning the personal direction of Prussia's policy. What happened, however, is fairly indicated by the titles of Marcks's fourth and fifth chapters: in 1862, with the opening of "The Great Decade," "The Years of William's Own Policy" closed. This result was not reached without constant friction and occasional crises. William possessed too strong a character to accept, without resistance, plans that he only partially comprehended and ventures of which he could not see the outcome. He was also, with all his ambition, too conscientious a man to do what he thought wrong. Bismarck, however, had a remarkable power of lucid statement and coercive reasoning; and when persuasion failed he did not hesitate to force the king's hand by the irresistible logic of events. In many cases William doubtless failed to see that the situation which constrained him had been deliberately created. There can be little question that in 1866 he as firmly believed Austria to be the aggressor as he believed France to be the aggressor in 1870. It does not

¹ *Begründung des deutschen Reiches*, II. 293.

escape Marcks that William's reluctances were of real value to Prussia. They minimized the impression of unscrupulousness which Bismarck's policy was too apt to arouse. Benedetti¹ also appreciates this; but his conclusion that William was really as clever as Bismarck, and a hypocrite besides, unduly exalts William's intelligence at the cost of his character.

If in the long run William realized that it was not he but his chancellor who was shaping history, his mind was too just to harbor resentment and his nature too noble for jealousy. In the long run, as Marcks asserts, and as we may well believe, William's confidence and gratitude ripened into sincere affection. After the establishment of the Empire no court intrigues, however strongly supported, were able seriously to shake Bismarck's position. The alliance between the government and the Liberals, which began in 1866 and persisted for a decade, entailed many results which the Emperor did not like; but he accepted them. The treaty of alliance with Austria in 1879 seriously distressed him, because it seemed to destroy all prospects of cordial relations with Russia; but he accepted that, too. This was the last important conflict; during the remaining eight years of William's reign we hear of no more "friction" between the Emperor and his chancellor.

William's relations with Roon and Moltke are discussed with equal acuteness and frankness. In military affairs William was at home. The reorganization of the army, Marcks maintains, was his personal work, rather than Roon's; and if the strategy of 1866 and 1870-71 was Moltke's, William was, nevertheless, really commander-in-chief in both wars. His highest title to fame, however, will always rest on the facts that he knew men as few men know their fellows; that he selected great men for great tasks, with little reference to his own likes or dislikes; and that having found the right men he retained them in the face of opposition in the chambers, in the press, and even in his own household.

Of his book, as a contribution to history, Marcks speaks with great modesty. He has used, he says, only printed material. He has used, however, all that there is—witness his excellent bibliography—and he has used it with great discretion. He has, in many cases, placed upon known facts a new and more reasonable interpretation. His book is one which no student of the period can afford not to read.

MUNROE SMITH.

The Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents. Edited by REUBEN GOLD THWAITES, Secretary of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin. Vols. V.-XV. (Cleveland: The Burrows Brothers Company. 1897, 1898. Pp. 298, 330, 312, 314, 315, 328, 279, 277, 272, 289, 250.)

V. WITH this volume begins the actual settlement of Canada, in other words the first few settlers who came for the purpose of tilling the

¹ "William I. and Prince Bismarck," in *Studies in Diplomacy* (English translation), Macmillan and Co., 1896.

soil arrived during the early summer of 1632. They were married people with children, all from the province of Perche, inured to work in the field, experts at clearing the forest, and each man possessing besides a trade of his own, such as that of carpenter, mason, or harnessmaker. No immigrants of that class had yet been seen on the shores of the St. Lawrence. The little fort at Quebec, in a dilapidated state, was handed over by the English to the agents of the Hundred Partners, July 13, 1632, and the French were again in possession of Canada. Fathers Le Jeune and De Noue had arrived from France eight days before, much exhausted by a voyage of seventy-eight days. "The size of our cabins," says Father Le Jeune, "was such that we could not stand upright, kneel, or sit down; and, what is worse, during the rain, the water fell at times upon my face. Father De Noue's feet and hands were frozen. I had a pain in my head or breast and a keen thirst, because we ate nothing but salted food, and there was no fresh water upon our vessel."

The first sight of the Indians, at Tadoussac, caused him a deep astonishment. He had evidently quite a fanciful idea of them, and probably a poetical one, which soon vanished from his imagination. "It seemed to me that I was looking at those maskers who run about in France in Carnival time." These Tadoussac people had recently gone against the Iroquois and they were in the act of torturing several prisoners of that nation brought back after the raid. This not only roused the feeling of the good missionary but also caused the Frenchmen to fear the vengeance of the Iroquois at some future moment. The father realizes the horror of his situation, and adds calmly: "I am here like the pioneers who go ahead to dig the trenches; after them come brave soldiers, who besiege and take the place." His letter shows his power of observation in all that can be seen of Canada at that time. The Indians, he thinks, should be civilized a little at least before attempting to teach them religious duties; the French themselves might learn how to make a living in this country before trying to dominate it. All the wise things he writes from the first hours of his arrival here are worth reading. There is an excellent portrait of Father Le Jeune prefaced to the volume, and also other illustrations. The notes and explanations are abundant and valuable.

VI. The years 1633-34 present the Indian problem under nearly all its difficult aspects. How to inspire the Montagnais and the Algonquins with a taste for sedentary life, in order to educate them and improve their condition; or if this is found impossible, what can be done to obtain the same results notwithstanding their nomadic habits? Father Le Jeune tried earnestly and cleverly to solve the question. It is plain that he understood it in the main points, and would have come to some practical result—not to say a perfect success—had it not been for the false notions on that subject which prevailed amongst the patrons or benefactors in France, concerned in the missions of Canada. It is true that a long experience in this matter has shown us the impossibility of modifying the roaming Indian, but at the commencement of the colony

Father Le Jeune had no means of comparison and he showed himself more competent than any man of his day to deal in a reasonable way with this insurmountable obstacle. Next he explains his views in regard to the Huron tribes, quite a different sort of savages from those of Tadoussac and Quebec, on account of their commercial organization and their sedentary character. This, of course, induced the above mentioned "patrons" to turn their attention to Upper Canada and to neglect the roving bands of the lower Province, but to no better advantage, for it had the effect to send the missionaries too far away from the base of operations, which was Quebec, and in a few months it brought the fighting Iroquois to the Huron villages. A third consideration was the Iroquois themselves, a powerful foe standing on the westward route, and which could only be subdued by the use of troops; but the Hundred Partners never attended to this part of their duty, and left the Jesuits, in fact the whole colony, without any help against the invaders.

This volume contains a mass of information upon the life and customs of the Indians. It is one of the most remarkable in the series.

VII., VIII., IX. These three volumes comprise the years 1634-36 and deal with Cape Breton, Quebec and the Huron country. They are not all written by Father Le Jeune; sometimes he encloses relations transmitted to him by Perrault, in Cape Breton, or Brebeuf in Upper Canada, which he forwards to Paris as Superior of the missions of New France.

Julien Perrault (1634) describes the situation, climate, resources, and people of the island of Cape Breton. He speaks of Chibou, now called Bras d'Or. In the middle of that great bay, on the left-hand side, as one enters from the sea, was the fort of Sainte Anne, at the entrance of the harbor, opposite a little cove—an excellent port easy to defend against any enemy. There was situated the first mission of the Jesuits in New France, the second mission or residence being located at Miscou. Father Le Jeune explains that as the vessels which go to Cape Breton and to Miscou (Gaspé) do not go up as far as Quebec, "it thus happens that we have no communication with our Fathers who are in the Residences of Sainte-Anne and of Saint Charles of Miskou, except by way of France; hence, neither letters nor other things should be sent to us to hold for them, but they should be given to those vessels which go to these French settlements."

Perrault naturally finds that the Indians of Cape Breton lack in the knowledge of God and of the service that they ought to render to him, as also of the state of the soul after death; nevertheless, he admires the honesty and decency of their conduct: "Everything is free to them in all places, and yet nothing is in danger in their presence, even if they are alone in a cabin and where no one can see them." His conclusion is that these people will be easily Christianized. He, like all the missionaries of his time, entertained a wrong conception of the character and temperament of the aborigines; he also overestimated the aid his own countrymen were disposed to contribute towards the conversion of the

infidels. Yet it cannot be said that he was altogether dreaming, for he must have been aware of the rumor circulating in Paris, Rouen and Dieppe, of the changes intended to be made in the administration of New France at that very moment. The embarrassed financial position of the Hundred Partners, also the persistent decline of health in Champlain, engaged Richelieu to accept the offer of the Knights of Malta, who were willing to assume the direction of New France and work the scheme of establishing colonies in Acadia, in Cape Breton, on the St. Lawrence and the Great Lakes. During the years 1635-36, Châteaufort was sent to Quebec; Montmagny and Delisle arrived there soon after. Razilly went to Acadia, Sillery had a hand in the whole affair, and all these new comers brought with them the hope of an effectual and glorious administration. Before the year 1636 was over, circumstances of a higher order paralyzed the actions of the Knights and everything went back to the *status quo*. The Hundred Partners made a compromise with an association of a few merchants of Dieppe, Rouen and Paris for the trade of Canada, with the hope of seeing the dawn of better days.

During this time Father Le Jeune was studying Quebec and the neighboring districts, writing invaluable letters on the subject and preparing himself for improvements that never came in his days. He describes the language of the Montagnais, which, though deficient in expressions for abstract ideas, he praises for its fullness and richness in vocabulary and grammatical forms. Once master of the idioms, and assisted by the resources of a strong colonial government, he expected to bring the Indian tribes to a reasonable state of civilization, and place them alongside of a prosperous agricultural colony of Frenchmen. He knew well that the trials of the last thirty years amounted to nothing towards the aim, but he was in receipt of letters from France which spoke with such warmth of the future of Canada that he really believed in a full and complete success. In fact things showed a better appearance than in the past, but there was not much behind that. The Hundred Partners never, at any time, meant to colonize Canada or any part thereof. All they cared for was the fur-trade and they did not even know how to conduct it properly in order to make it a paying business. In 1636, as already stated, the company abandoned Canada into the hands of seven or eight associated merchants, under certain conditions which were in hardly any respect fulfilled, so that the colony went from bad to worse. The creation of this private company did not affect the charter still in possession of the Hundred Partners, but as the latter were unacquainted with trade or navigation they simply remained in the shade, and the firm of Rosée, Cheffault, Castillon, Juchereau, Berruyer, Duhamel and Fouquet reigned supreme over the St. Lawrence. The Hundred Partners seemed at first to be willing to send over colonists; they made concessions to Giffard, Bourdon, Leneuf, Godefroy and others, obliging those to whom lands were given to assume the company's duties of clearing such lands, and sending and supporting the settlers; but the few families who came under that management had to find a living by themselves and as a result the recruiting

in France was discouraged from the outset. Rosée, Cheffault and Company acted in the same manner as the great company; cleared no land and only sent provisions from France for their own fur-trade employees. Father Le Jeune had said in 1635 that the Hundred Partners were "discharging their duties perfectly, although at a very great expense" in regard to procuring actual settlers; this is not confirmed by the facts, since we can only find seventy men of that class arriving from 1632 to 1639, and as far as we can ascertain coming of their own accord, and at their own expense. Statements made in 1641 and 1642 concerning the approximate population corroborate our opinion in this matter. The number of settlers up to 1636 was forty-three, according to our own calculation. Father Le Jeune said in the fall of that year, that if the Jesuits had a school in Quebec they might expect to teach twenty or thirty French pupils. Three Rivers had no children at that date. Father Le Jeune adds: "A poor man burdened with a wife and children should not come over here the first years with his family, if he is not hired by the Gentlemen of the Company, or by some one else who will bring them hither: otherwise he will suffer greatly and will not make any headway." Such was the situation, and we find there is no room for praise.

The narratives concerning the Hurons are to be found in Volume VIII.

X.-XV., 1634-1639, the Hurons, Quebec, Three Rivers. These six volumes form a series by themselves and must be examined together. They represent six years of sanguine expectation of progress entered by the Frenchmen in Canada. They tell us of the bright promise received from the mother country and also of the openings the missionaries expected to have on the Great Lakes through the apparent good dispositions of the Hurons and other allied tribes. The reading of anterior *Relations* had truly excited the piety of several men and women of some influence in three or four cities of France, and there was a movement on foot tending to help the missionaries, even by colonization, but this latter part of the programme was soon paralyzed by the indifference of the Hundred Partners. What resulted from the sudden ardor of those well-intending persons was merely the commencement of a hospital and an Ursuline school in 1639. The scheme to establish the Knights of Malta at the head of the colony fell through, on account of the Order being called to do duty in the East; and on the side of the Hurons war prevented any development of the religious missions in Upper Canada. During these years of expectation the Jesuits were prompted to furnish as much information as they could obtain concerning the country and to suggest measures of general improvement. This situation renders the letters of 1634-39 most interesting, and when we know that they were written by men like Le Jeune and Brebeuf they attract necessarily the utmost attention.

Six residences or Jesuit missions existed in New France: Sainte Anne of Cape Breton, Saint Charles at Miscou, Notre Dame de Recouvrance at Quebec near the fort, Notre Dame des Anges half a league from

Quebec, Conception at Three Rivers, Saint Joseph at Ihonatiria among the Hurons—this latter being the mother house of five or six other missions spread throughout Upper Canada between Lakes Huron and Erie. Fourteen priests, besides their assistants, were distributed in this manner from the mouth of the St. Lawrence to the eastern shores of Lake Huron.

It was not without a sort of spite that the Algonquins of the Ottawa noticed the arrival of Brebeuf in the Huron country, for they were jealous of the facilities the Frenchmen would impart to the Hurons in the way of traffic if they were allowed to have close intercourse. The mind of the Algonquins, as well as that of the Hurons and the Iroquois, never realized in those days the purpose of the missionaries: they naturally saw nothing but trade and commerce in the doings of all classes of Europeans. Hence from the moment the Jesuits took permanent residence in the Huron country the Iroquois determined upon a war to the death against these people, because they felt that the French were becoming the masters of the fur-trade around the lakes. Brebeuf says that in 1635, the Iroquois having alarmed some Huron villages, a rumor circulated that the Algonquins had warned the Hurons of the sad result of the coming of the black gowns amongst them. They had not foreseen the nature of the trouble which they predicted. Soon after, the Iroquois having shown some desire to attack Allumette Island, the Algonquins ran to the Hurons for assistance. By that time the Iroquois had made up their minds to destroy both nations and they entered (1636) openly upon the execution of that plan. Father Brebeuf and his missionaries in the Huron country had no means to detect the danger nor to repulse it. They wrote in full belief that the omens were most favorable. It is painful to us when reading those enthusiastic letters to think that the enterprise of the missions was on the verge of the most terrible tragedy destined to take place in the annals of this new continent.

In brief the little headway made from 1632 to 1639 may be considered as marking a period of prosperity if compared with the years that followed.

BENJAMIN SULTE.

Old Virginia and her Neighbors. By JOHN FISKE. (Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin and Co. 1897. Two vols., pp. xxi, 318; xvi, 421.)

We are told in the preface of this interesting work that in the series of books on American history upon which the author has for many years been engaged, the present volumes come between *The Discovery of America* and *The Beginnings of New England*. To complete the picture of the early times and to make connection with *The American Revolution* and *The Critical Period of American History* (two charming works of Dr. Fiske with which the public is familiar), the author promises two further contributions, of which one, entitled *The Dutch and Quaker Colonies in America*, is already in preparation, and the other, yet unnamed, but which will resume the history of New England at the accession of

William and Mary, will follow as soon as possible. Thus the design of the author is to afford in the end a connected story of the thirteen English American communities up to the time when they became permanently united as the United States of America, under the Constitution framed at Philadelphia in 1787.

The plan of the present work is to group under one treatment the colonies formerly comprised within the territory of South Virginia. As a mother standing among her children, the original commonwealth, Old Virginia, receives from the author the largest share of attention, but he takes care not to neglect the younger commonwealths (her "Neighbors") Maryland, North Carolina and South Carolina, which were taken from her at different times. Beginning with an account of the spirit of commercial adventure which led to the settlement at Jamestown, the author sweeps before the reader's eye the ever-widening wave of cause and effect, which, proceeding from the landing of the settlers on the fateful fourteenth day of May, 1607, rolled ever onward, west, north and south, up the James, the York, and the Rappahannock, over Maryland, Carolina, and Georgia, till in the fullness of time the widening circles swept over the Appalachian ranges, to traverse the broad valley of the Mississippi.

Dr. Fiske deserves the highest praise for this work. There is present in these charming volumes such a profusion of knowledge, such a pervading spirit of fairness, such a flowing stream of sympathy, that it is only just to say of the talented author that he appears in the grand, unfolding panorama of men and events as a master of narrative power.

What is more charming than his opening chapter? How the heart leaps out in salutation to those glorious "kings of the sea," Sir John Hawkins, Sir Francis Drake, Sir Humphrey Gilbert and Sir Walter Raleigh. There they stand on the very threshold of the Virginia colony, glorious sponsors for the future of her history—a history destined in the swift rolling years to compass the story of a republic of continental grandeur.

The vicissitudes of the colony at Jamestown receive a graphic treatment from Dr. Fiske, who stands stoutly up for the celebrated John Smith and the gentle Pocahontas. The objections urged by some who in recent days have sought to throw discredit on the most romantic incident in American history—the famous rescue at Werowocomoco—are denounced for their utter "flimsiness." Dr. Fiske has a theory of his own in reference to the matter, but it appears to me that resting as the story does on direct evidence, no added reasons are necessary to vindicate its truth. All that the objectors adduce or can adduce against the incident is in the nature of circumstantial evidence, which in the absence of an opportunity for cross-examination amounts to very little in either a court of law or a court of history.

The chapters on Claiborne's contest with Lord Baltimore, and on Nathaniel Bacon's war with Sir William Berkeley, are splendid examples of a faithful adherence to facts, expressed with the highest literary finish.

Where so much excellence prevails, it almost seems an ungracious task to point out errors. A few changes in the text, however, might be advantageously made.

Of the danger of generalizing from conditions which in their nature can be but partially stated, Dr. Fiske appears perfectly aware. In fact he repeatedly warns us against the sin so generally committed of "sweeping assertions." But does he not sometimes seem to forget to act up to his own standard of precaution? For instance, when he states that from an educational standpoint there was an "undeniable contrast" between New England and Virginia, is he not repeating a claim not borne out by modern investigations? Did in fact any such contrast exist? Could a sorer picture of ignorance be found than that painted by William Root Bliss, from the town records of colonial Massachusetts? From the work accredited by Mr. Bliss to the town clerks in New England, their spelling was not even up to the vague standard of that age, when the dictionary was a more or less useless article. Unquestionably, we must largely discount the Baroness de Riedesel's statement that "only one in ten" of the men of Massachusetts, about the time of the Revolution, could write. Nor ought we to take too seriously the declaration of John Adams made in Congress about the same time, that the fishermen of New England were as "degraded as slaves." These statements, however, and others like them which may be cited, contain, perhaps, just enough truth to make us chary of accepting Dr. Fiske's estimate of the existence of any real "contrast."

After a like manner, a pretty just objection might be made to Dr. Fiske's habit of referring to Virginia as an "aristocracy" and to New England as a "democracy." The fact is that the formal aristocracy of Virginia was conditioned on so many democratic features, and the formal democracy of New England was so essentially aristocratic, that society in the two sections afforded no grounds for the contrast suggested by the use of the terms. For if in New England all the officers except the magistrates were elected, it must be remembered that the forms of elections the limited extent of the franchise, and the narrow and illiberal spirit of the voters, prevented any real popular control. The truth is that from the beginning caste was in high favor in New England. It must be said that the statutes of Virginia afford no order like that of the general court of Massachusetts in 1651, which expressly pointed out the distinction between "the better class," those "above the ordinary degree," and those of "mean condition." It may be true that the office-holders of Virginia were confessedly life officers. Yet their powers were always subject to the will of the House of Burgesses, in which the people ruled supreme, the oft-stated freehold restriction on voting being until 1736 totally undefined and inoperative.

As time went on two things emphasized the spirit of democracy in Virginia. The first was the isolated lives led by the inhabitants, and the second was the growth of slavery of the negro race. Isolation promoted self-confidence and self-reliance, and negro slavery made race and not

class the real distinction in society. I have myself noticed how quickly the servant who had no handle to his name is addressed in the county records, after serving his apprenticeship and becoming a freeman, with the title of "Mr.," a term of high respect in those days. Mr. Bliss on the contrary declares that the great majority of the people of New England were addressed by the homely title of "goodman." The Southern critic might desire that the elements of undesirable population imported into Virginia had not been so great, but Dr. Fiske shows that these people had very little real authority in shaping the destinies of the colonies. After all, the vicious emigration to which the Northern states have been subjected during the present century has long since equalized the accounts between the sections, so far as this feature is concerned.

The account which Dr. Fiske gives on page 198 of Volume II., of the laws regarding slaves, might also be desirably modified. Many of the harsher statutes mentioned by him as applying to the whole colonial period had in fact either a late enactment, temporary application, or partial enforcement. To say that murder of a slave was not punishable is unquestionably an error. The offence was punishable like any other murder, though the law declared that it was not murder if a slave accidentally died from correction, or was killed while resisting his master. In the *Virginia Gazette*, as early as 1737, is an account of the hanging of a wicked master who cruelly beat his slave to death.

A word, too, may be uttered in favor of Dr. John Pott, who acted as one of the early governors of Virginia. In mentioning the fact that Dr. Pott was convicted of stealing cattle, the seriousness of the charge undoubtedly required the additional statement that the Privy Council in England, on a review of the case, declared that the Doctor had been unjustly treated. As he is also charged by Dr. Fiske with being of a convivial turn, it is but right to say that Dr. Neill, on whom Dr. Fiske relies, was mistaken in his reference, since the original authority, George Sandys, clearly alluded to young Christopher Calthorpe and not to Dr. Pott.

Again in saying that Maryland had no newspapers until 1745, Dr. Fiske departs from his customary accuracy, since Willam Parks began the *Maryland Gazette* at Annapolis as early as 1727.

There will doubtless be a great demand for Dr. Fiske's volumes, and I feel quite sure from the painstaking disposition of the author that he will rest very easy under criticism and be most happy to remedy as far as possible all defects in future editions of his work. There can be no hesitation in saying that the appearance of these volumes constitutes an epoch in the history of the literature appertaining to Virginia.

LYON GARDINER TYLER.

[Just as these pages are going through the press we receive the following communication from Mr. Lewis L. Kropf, the Hungarian scholar, on the question of Captain Smith's veracity.]

I fully agree with Professor Fiske that it is highly important to know whether any of Captain Smith's narratives are truthful or not. The con-

troverſy on this point has now laſted three centuries, as he ſays, and will to my mind laſt many centuries longer, ſo long in fact as "hiſtorians of a later age" will continue to conſult their own convenience and not take the trouble to look for materials of evidence in the proper quarter. To ſettle the point I have ransacked Hungarian ſources and at the beginning of 1890 contributed a ſhort ſeries of articles to the London *Notes and Queries* (7th Ser., Vol. IX.) in which I adduced more than ample evidence to prove that Captain Smith's exploits in Hungary, Tranſylvania, Wallachia and Moldavia as related by himſelf in the *True Travels and Adventures* are a worthless pseudo-hiſtorical romance, and that the bogus grant of arms to Smith by the Prince of Tranſylvania is a clumsy piece of forgery that could not poſſibly miſlead any one poſſeſſing more than a ſuperficial knowledge of Hungarian hiſtory. I communicated the verbatim text of this precious document to the Hungarian Heraldical Society about the ſame time, and it was read at one of their meetings and received with peals of deriſive laughter by the hiſtorians preſent. There never was and never will be any controverſy in Hungary about the veracity of Captain Smith. The text of the document alone was ſufficient to brand him as an impudent forger.

The articles in *Notes and Queries* have unfortunately eſcaped the notice of Captain Smith's laſteſt biographer, in the *English Dictionary of National Biography*, and therefore it is not to be wondered at that they have remained unknown to Profeſſor Fiske in far Maſſachuſetts. Conſequentlſ, as I ſaid, ink will continue to flow and "the ſmoke of the conflict" will continue "to hover about the field." Had Profeſſor Fiske read my contribution to the controverſy he would have penned Chapter III. of his *Old Virginia and her Neighbors* in a totally different frame of mind, no doubt, and inevitably come to the concluſion that "the ſtaggering blow between the eyes" of which he writes was the one that gravelled the Virginian Ananias and not the "flippanſt critics" who laugh at his rodomontades.

LEWIS L. KROFF.

LONDON, 16 May, 1898.

Colonial Mobile. By PETER J. HAMILTON, A.M. (Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin and Co. 1897. Pp. xxii, 446.)

THE vaſt region, draining from the Tennessee waſterſhed to the Gulf, and here firſt characterized as the Alabama-Tombigbee Baſin, rich in natural features and hiſtoric intereſt, finds in this volume an exhaustive and appreciative preſentation of its hiſtory. While the work is called *Colonial Mobile*, it concerns not alone the town of that name, but the ſettlement and expanſion of population in the whole baſin, while under the rule of foreign powers, and during the early years of American control. The period covered, 1519-1821, is divided into ſix parts, with an appendix of documents and collateral matter. Within theſe three centuries come the diſcovery and exploration by the Spaniſh, 1519-1670; the ſet-

tlement and growth of the French, 1670-1763; the domination of the British, 1763-1780; and the occupation of the Spanish, 1780-1813. In none of the general histories of Louisiana, Mississippi, Florida, or Alabama, indeed in no work, has emphasis been placed on the fact that the Mobile Basin has been the centre of an important influence and history from the early explorations of the sixteenth down to the present century. Failing to appreciate this importance the treatment of its history has heretofore been subordinate and meagre. The author finds the explanation in the fact that "Spain, France and England lost the territory so long ago as to have lost likewise interest in its history. It has, too, so long been severed from the Mississippi valley, which was colonized from its shores, that the historians of modern Louisiana have known personally but little of this the original seat of that great empire, and have devoted their attention mainly to the later growth which centered on the lower Mississippi."

Coming therefore to a consideration of the history of the area included in his subject, the author views it as a distinct field of influence and activity, and duly emphasizes its larger historical aspects. The result is a work of more than local interest. The early explorations are reviewed, and confirmatory evidences are presented which show the correctness of Dr. Scaife's identification of the Spanish Rio del Espiritu Santo with Mobile River and Bay. Then comes the making clear the fact that for about twenty years under the French the town of Mobile was not only a colony but distinctively the French capital of Louisiana—the Mississippi Valley—and that afterwards it was still more than a settlement, although not the capital, for it was the head of the Department of Mobile, and the chief seat south of Canada of French influence among the Indians. After the English had become the conquerors, it was important for its touch with the Indians, and through Bayou Manchac for its control of the English half of the Mississippi valley. During the Spanish period, which is more local, the running of Ellicott's line and the Louisiana purchase again bring the section into the current of broad history. Under the Americans the Creek War and the Bay engagements are among the brilliant events in the annals of the Union.

The purely local annals are given in considerable fulness. The beginnings of settlements, local exploration, the establishments of forts and trade relations with the Indians and all the detail of intercourse with them, the lives of the people and of their immediate rulers, the relations of the colonists to those of the adjacent powers, are all noted in graphic form. Appropriately interwoven with the general narrative are sketches of the leading characters. As a town chronicle the book is one of great value, giving full details as to early settlers, names of persons and places, government, etc. It has definitely located the first French Mobile, and fixed the site of old Fort Charlotte. There is a careful study of all the old land grants.

The execution of the work evinces an earnest enthusiasm and painstaking care which only the student of modern historical method can ap-

preciate. It is not in any sense a mere expansion or an enlargement in the treatment of old facts. Making clear the distinctive character of his theme, the author has recast the whole treatment. This, together with the wealth of additional material introduced, gives to the work the first place as authority. It is in a sense hardly fair to make such a comparison, but it is interesting to note that Pickett, the leading historian of the period, gives but one chapter to British control, while Hamilton gives nine; Pickett dismisses the later Spanish occupation in one chapter, with nothing of their local history, while Hamilton devotes eleven chapters to the same subject. The usual authorities have been freely used, and often with new interpretation. The search for new material seems to have been exhaustive. The author spared neither pains nor expense in securing all that was to be found that would contribute in the most remote way to the elucidation of his theme. The whole of the local field has been personally explored by him. Among the new authorities never before used, and which are cited, are the records of the Catholic Church at Mobile from 1704, the papers of General Haldimand, papers from the British colonial office, the *American State Papers* the departmental archives of the United States, the local land, court, and municipal records, the files of the *Mobile Register* and other newspapers, together with numerous old letters and unpublished memoirs. The illustrations, with few exceptions all new, include many rare and hitherto unknown early maps, which add greatly to the value and completeness of the book. All in all the work is one of superior merit, and must hold a permanent place in our historical literature.

THOMAS McADORY OWEN.

Select Documents illustrative of the History of the United States from 1776 to 1861, edited with notes by WILLIAM MACDONALD, Professor of History and Political Science in Bowdoin College. (New York: The Macmillan Co. 1898. Pp. xiii, 465.)

THE first document is the Declaration of Independence and the last one is the Constitution of the Confederate States. The whole number is ninety-seven, and they are arranged in chronological order. Accompanying each document or related group there is a paragraph of explanatory matter, bibliographical references to the sources of the selections and collateral references to other works. It is the aim of the author to utilize the space of a single volume of convenient size for presenting "such documents as any one pretending even to an elementary acquaintance with the history of the United States may fairly be expected to know." While not rare or new, many of the selections are not conveniently accessible to the ordinary student. Seventeen of the precious pages are occupied with the Constitution of the United States, a document so accessible that it might have been omitted from the collection except that the book is designed to be used as a student's manual in company with lectures or a narrative text, and reference to the Constitution would be frequent.

If twelve representative teachers of United States history were appointed each to make an independent collection of the documents which in his judgment would be most helpful to the ordinary student of United States history and sufficient in quantity for a convenient hand-book, half of the space in each of the twelve volumes would probably be filled with matter practically identical. The remaining space would express individual peculiarities of the teacher.

Our author has omitted all tariff acts and all documents referring to a tariff policy, with the single exception of Hamilton's report on manufactures; the only other references to the subject are in cases where the tariff is incidentally involved in the general subject of finance or where it threatens the Union of the States. All acts organizing departments of the executive and the courts are omitted; all party platforms; all speeches with the single exception of the Webster-Hayne debate. There are no selections from newspapers or private letters. The longest document is the decision of the Supreme Court in the Dred Scott case, occupying nineteen pages. Apart from this there are no judicial decisions. Our policy of internal improvements, our policy as to the disposal of the public domain, and the Indian policy are passed over without documentary reference. These observations are not made by way of disparagement but rather to show the necessarily limited character of such a hand-book.

Three main topics occupy each about a third of the space. These are Banking and Financiering, our Foreign Relations, and questions involving the Union of the States, including of course the slavery question. The only documents not conveniently grouped under one or another of these three heads are the few constitutions or documents of fundamental law, the Ordinance of 1787 being a part of our fundamental law. Washington's message for the suppression of the Whiskey Rebellion may be classified as administrative financiering. The Alien and Sedition Laws are intimately connected both with our foreign policy and with the Union of the States. Only one naturalization law is given, that of 1793, because of its relation to the reactionary policy against foreigners. The one exception which proves the rule is the Tenure of Office Act of 1820. No one will deny that the three topics chosen are of primary interest in the period covered. It is a question whether it would not be a better plan, instead of running the list chronologically without a break, to group the papers under the three natural divisions and then, by the selections and by the bibliographical references, to give the treatment of them something of the air of completeness.

The one topic which, as presented in the book, most nearly approaches completeness of treatment is that of United States Banks. In Hamilton's reports there is a documentary account of the origin of the First Bank and its constitutionality is discussed in papers from Jefferson and Hamilton. The act establishing the first bank is omitted, while the act establishing the second one is given. Seventeen documents exhibit the famous controversy between President Jackson and the Bank. These are messages and vetos of the President, acts of Congress, resolution of

censure in the Senate and the expunging resolution, transactions between the Treasurer and the Bank and between the Treasurer and certain state banks. The shortest document in the book reads: "Sir: You will deliver to the collector at Philadelphia all bonds to the United States, payable on or after the first of October next, which may be in your possession on receipt of this order." The letter is signed by R. B. Taney, Secretary of the Treasury, and is directed to Nicholas Biddle, Esq., President of the Bank of the United States, Philadelphia. The "bonds" referred to are warehouse bonds held by the bank for the collection of customs. October 1, 1833, had been selected as the date for removing deposits and transferring them to state banks. Two other letters have the same date, September 26, 1833. One is directed to the Collector of Philadelphia, commissioning him to receive the bonds described in the above document, and the other is an official notice to the Girard Bank that it is made a depository for funds collected in the vicinity of Philadelphia. The subject of financiering apart from the relation of the treasury to the banks is not so fully treated, there being, indeed, little on the subject apart from Hamilton's reports and the sub-treasury acts.

The collection of documents exhibiting our foreign relations is admirable. I do not see how the space could have been better utilized. There are the ten treaties of primary importance, including every treaty by which territory was acquired; the joint resolution annexing Texas; collections of papers relating to the two chief wars; President Monroe's message and other documents. It would be easy to make a long list of omissions, but there is evidence of much care in the sifting.

It is difficult to go amiss in the selection of the leading documents on the Union of the States. There were four periods at which the strength of the Union was especially tested. In the case of two of these our foreign relations were the exciting cause; in the third it was the tariff question, and in the fourth the slavery question. Corresponding to these four periods there stand out prominently the Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions of 1798-99, the proceedings of the Hartford Convention of 1814, the Nullification Act of South Carolina in 1832, and the formation of the Confederacy in 1861. The last seventy pages of the book are occupied with a pretty complete list of documents beginning with the compromise measures of 1850 and leading up to the Civil War. Of course during this part of our history the slavery question is thoroughly merged into the question of the Union of States; but previous to this date the slavery question has an interest of its own quite apart from the doctrine of state rights. It is in the list of papers bearing upon the slavery question previous to 1850 that occurs what seems to me the most singular omission in the book. I refer to the famous contest over the Right of Petition and the Gag Resolutions. The constitution of the Anti-slavery Society, organized in 1833, is given, but the stirring events that gave the society its significance are not mentioned.

On the whole, the book is to be highly commended. It is a well-winnowed collection of useful material for giving the air of reality to our

history. The explanatory matter accompanying the documents is well suited to the purpose intended. The bibliographical references to public documents will be of great assistance to those wishing to extend the investigation.

JESSE MACY.

The Life of Charles Carroll of Carrollton, 1737-1832, with his Correspondence and Public Papers. By KATE MASON ROWLAND. (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1898. Two vols., pp. xx, 400, 487.)

THE author of the excellent *Life of George Mason* has fully sustained her reputation as a biographer in the present volumes. They are characterized by extensive research, good judgment and literary skill; and the reader is carried along by her attractive pages from the youth to the old age of Charles Carroll of Carrollton with increasing interest at every step of his eventful career. This work contains so much valuable material for the historical student, for Carroll was a great letter-writer, that the wonder now is that it had not appeared before. The author has had the use of the family papers now in the possession of descendants of Carroll, the Hon. John Lee Carroll, heir and occupant of "Doughoregan Manor," the estate of Charles Carroll of Carrollton; the Rev. Thomas Sim Lee of Washington, D. C.; and Mrs. William C. Pennington of Baltimore. These were supplemented by valuable letters and papers in the Archives of the State of Maryland, in the library of the Maryland Historical Society, in the Scharf collection of the Johns Hopkins University, and numerous other depositories and autograph collections. There are but few breaks in the record, and the author has handled her abundant materials with care and thoroughness; and "wherever it is possible, letting his own pen guide her record."

Charles Carroll of Carrollton reached the ripe age of ninety-five and is known most conspicuously to posterity as "the last of the signers" of the Declaration of Independence. The well-rounded career of this illustrious and virtuous statesman falls roughly into three periods, of nearly equal cycles: the first, the period of his youth and education; the second and most important, his thirty years of public life and service; and finally the last thirty-two years of his life, when he retired to the quiet and rest of his estate at Doughoregan Manor, in Howard County, Maryland. The Carrolls of Maryland are legion, and at the time of the American Revolution there were four families, all more or less prominent in the social and political affairs of the state. The Carroll pedigree is an old and famous one, the Carrolls of Carrollton and Doughoregan Manor tracing their ancestry to "the old Irish princely family of the Carrolls of Ely O'Carroll, Kings County, Ireland." Charles Carroll, the grandfather of Charles Carroll of Carrollton, was descended in the fourteenth degree from "Fiam or Florence, King of Ely, who died in 1205." The elder Carroll, a Roman Catholic, at the age of twenty-eight migrated to Maryland

in 1688, with a commission as Attorney-General of Maryland and with liberal grants of land from the Lord Proprietary, with whose family marriage had indirectly connected him. The "Protestant Revolution" occurred soon after his arrival, and, in the words of his grandson, he "was destined to experience, even in the asylum he had selected, the evils of that religious persecution from which he had so recently fled. As a Catholic, he was deprived of office." But Carroll received other offices through the favor of Charles, third Lord Baltimore, and gradually obtained large tracts of land, 60,000 acres in all, in various parts of the province, thus laying the foundation of the princely fortune of his descendant, Charles Carroll of Carrollton. "Doughoregan Manor," an estate of 10,000 acres, was included in the above.

Charles Carroll, the second of the line in Maryland, was born in 1702 and through the death of an older brother, Henry, became the heir to his father's estate. The third Charles Carroll "of Carrollton" was born at Annapolis, September 19, 1737. From 1748 to 1757 we find him in France, where he received his classical education. In the latter year he took up his residence in London to study the law, and in 1765 he returned to Maryland. During his residence abroad an interesting correspondence was carried on between father and son, and much of it is reproduced by the author. We note the care with which the father follows the training of his son, advises him about his studies and his acquaintances, praises and exhorts good scholarship, and interests himself in his son's love affairs. He likewise informs him of political affairs at home and confides his feelings over the disabilities imposed upon Catholics by the provincial government, including the double taxation of their lands, and exclusion from office and the suffrage.

Indeed the elder Carroll thought of leaving Maryland altogether. He writes in July 1760: "From what I have said I leave you to judge whether Maryland be a tolerable residence for a Roman Catholic. Were I younger I would certainly quit it; at my age (as I wrote you) a change of climate would certainly shorten my days, but I embrace every opportunity of getting rid of my real property, that if you please you may the sooner and with more ease and less loss leave it." But he assures his son that the latter should be allowed to choose for himself.

The younger Charles was a diligent student; nevertheless, he found some time to mingle in London society, heard the great Pitt, made the acquaintance of Burke, and there met a number of fellow "Marylandians," including Daniel Dulany, his subsequent political antagonist.

The estate of "Carrollton," in Frederick County, part of a tract of land on the Potomac belonging to the original Charles Carroll, "the Immigrant," was to be settled upon the young Charles upon his return to Maryland and henceforth he was to be known as "Charles Carroll of Carrollton." The young Charles returned to Maryland in 1765 and we hear no more about leaving the province. The "disabilities" of Roman Catholics were soon removed, and he was to assume a large share in the activities of his state. It is quite probable that he signalized his return

to America by joining in a demonstration near the Manor against the obnoxious Stamp Act. Thus began the second cycle in his career. Carroll soon leaps into fame in his controversy with Daniel Dulany. The question at issue was the collection of officers' fees, which the House of Burgesses desired to reduce in amount, but in which they were opposed by the Council and Governor Eden, who finally settled the fees by proclamation at the former rate. In a series of articles in the *Maryland Gazette* waged between "Antillon" (Daniel Dulany) and the "First Citizen" (Charles Carroll of Carrollton), the latter championed the cause of the Burgesses and the people, maintained "that fees were taxes and taxes should only be laid upon the people by those who represented them." Four able letters, abounding in legal points and classic lore, appeared in the *Maryland Gazette* in 1773 in reply to as many able papers by "Antillon." The result was a popular victory for "First Citizen," and a repeal of the governor's proclamation followed. The will of the people had been vindicated. Following the "tax on tea" and the Boston Port Bill of 1774, we find Carroll taking part in the destruction of the tea-laden brig, the *Peggy Stewart*, in the harbor of Annapolis. He now appears as a member of the Maryland Convention, of the Provincial Committee of Correspondence, the Committee of Safety, and the Committee of Observation for his town and county. Indeed, Carroll's superior administrative ability commanded the respect of his fellows and he is made to serve on innumerable committees. On January 11, 1775, the Maryland Convention instructs its delegates in the Continental Congress to "disavow in the most solemn manner, all design in the Colonies of Independence," though this position was opposed by Carroll, who favored independence. Carroll is now called outside his state to serve the colonies on a mission to Canada together with Benjamin Franklin and Samuel Chase, as commissioners of Congress; their object being "to promote or form a union" between the colonies and Canada. They were also to supervise the military operations in Canada. The details of this expedition, which proved a failure, are found in the *Journal of Carroll*. Carroll reappeared in the Maryland Convention by June 24, 1776, and largely through his efforts, Maryland now fell into line with the other colonies for independence. On July 4 following, Carroll was chosen a delegate to the Continental Congress. He took his seat on the 18th and on August 2, Carroll and his colleagues signed the engrossed draft of the Declaration. The author refers to the oft-repeated story that Carroll added "of Carrollton" to his signature when jestingly reminded that there were others in Maryland bearing the same name, and points out that Carroll had always written his name thus since his return to America. Congress now placed him on the Board of War. In August, 1776, we again find Carroll in the Maryland Convention assisting on a committee in drafting a Declaration of Rights and Constitution for Maryland, which owed at least one unique feature to his authorship, the electoral college for the choice of state senators. Maryland's attitude on the adoption of the Articles of Confederation next claims attention. Maryland did not

propose to allow the states like Virginia possessing large Western lands an unjust advantage over those possessing none and instructed her delegates to secure an amendment authorizing and empowering the Congress "to ascertain and restrict the boundaries of such of the confederate states which claim to extend to the river Mississippi or South Sea." The author attributes this action to "an unfortunate and short-sighted jealousy against the states possessed of unsettled western lands;" and adds "it is surprising to find Maryland statesmen advocating it;" but fails to recognize the fact that this was the only way Maryland could protect her own interests, and that "justice and sound policy" justified her course of procedure in refusing to ratify until satisfactory concessions were made. Carroll was at Valley Forge in the winter of 1778 on a commission from the Continental Congress, and always remained a firm friend and supporter of Washington. In November 1778 Carroll resigned his seat in Congress, preferring, in common with many others at this time, to the dismay of Washington, a seat in the assembly of his own state. He was re-elected to Congress in 1780 but again resigned. In May 1783 he became president of the Maryland senate. He was next chosen a delegate to the Federal Convention, but declined. He was a leader of the Federalists in his state and undoubtedly had an active part in the adoption of the Constitution by the Maryland Convention of 1788, but we have no details of his views, as his correspondence covering this period has been lost. Carroll is now sent to the United States Senate and immediately engages in active committee work. He took a leading part in favor of the Funding Bill and favored the Potomac site for the capital of the United States and in recognition of his leadership in the latter movement, the Potomac party in the Senate was referred to by Maclay of Pennsylvania as "Carroll and Co." Maclay, however, was appeased by Carroll's amendment giving the temporary residence to Philadelphia for ten years. Carroll's term expired in two years, but he was returned to the Senate for a six years' term. He also held a seat at the same time in the Maryland senate, but upon the passage of a disqualifying law by the Maryland legislature in December, 1792, he remained in the Maryland senate and resigned his seat in the United States Senate, saying: "Thus I have got rid of a trust which I really accepted with reluctance."

Carroll now rounded out his public career in the Maryland legislature and performed many useful services to his state. He retired to private life in 1800 and almost simultaneously with the retirement of the Federalist party, of which he was a conspicuous member. He favored the Jay treaty, and opposed, with Hamilton and Washington, "the Jacobin tendencies of the French Republic." With the advent of the hitherto untried Jeffersonian democracy Carroll had strange forebodings of the future. Of Jefferson, he writes: "Mr. Jefferson is too theoretical and fanciful a statesman to direct with steadiness and prudence the affairs of this extensive and growing Confederacy." In his retirement at Doughoregan Manor, Charles Carroll of Carrollton still kept up his lively interest in public affairs, American and European, and the author

gives us a detailed insight into the views of this political philosopher and seer. The "Manor" was always a centre of attraction for people of culture and many distinguished guests, foreign and native, were entertained under its roof. In a contemporary paper is found this tribute: "His mansion has given celebrity to the hospitality of Maryland, by being opened to distinguished visitors from every quarter of the globe. The utility of his public life is gilded by the peaceful beams of his declining years."

July 4, 1826, marked the fiftieth anniversary of the Declaration of Independence and likewise the dramatic death of Jefferson and Adams, two of the three remaining "signers." Charles Carroll of Carrollton survived these events by six years and on November 14, 1832, he too "was gathered to his fathers."

Carroll was a gentleman, a scholar, and a statesman, though not always fortunate in his political prophecies. Punctuality, regular habits, frugality, modesty and purity of character were attributes of the man; and he was possessed to a marked degree of tact and executive ability.

This "limited letter press" edition of the life of Charles Carroll of Carrollton is an excellent sample of the printer's art and is unusually free from typographical errors. In Volume II., p. 360, line 19 should read 1828 (instead of 1822). In the Index, the reference to "Peggy Stewart Day" should read I. 131 (instead of II. 131). The work is minutely indexed and the author has taken great pains to indicate in footnotes the source of every letter and every statement quoted. While the correspondence of Carroll is freely incorporated in the text, his public papers are given in appendices, covering one third of the book, and include the *Letters of the First Citizen*, the *Journal of Charles Carroll of Carrollton, during his visit to Canada, in 1776, as one of the Commissioners from Congress*, the Carroll wills, 1718, 1728, 1780, 1831; and genealogical notes of the Carroll family, the latter being accompanied by an unique chart giving a synopsis of the O'Carroll pedigree. There is a bibliography and a list of portraits of Charles Carroll of Carrollton; and the book is illustrated with half-tones of the three Charles Carrolls, of Doughoregan Manor, and the Annapolis home, together with a frontispiece showing the "Arms of Carroll, chiefs of Ely, Kings County, Ireland," and bearing the motto *In fide et in bello forte*. It is significant that when his grandfather, Charles Carroll, the "Immigrant," came to Maryland in 1688, he changed the family motto to *Ubiqumque, cum Libertate*, and so it remained.

J. WM. BLACK.

The History of Our Navy, from its Origin to the Present Day, 1775-1897. By JOHN R. SPEARS. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1897. Four vols., pp. xv, 416; xvi, 425; xvi, 469; xx, 607.)

THE history of warfare, be it military or naval, is crowded with incident, resembling therein man's daily life in the world; but differing also

materially, in that the incidents are more often than not of a stirring or picturesque character. When operations are actually going on, as during the favorable seasons of a land campaign, and in naval warfare generally throughout the year, the multiplicity of affairs,—usually small, sometimes great,—impart to the picture, regarded as a whole, an impression of vivid action, the particulars of which are not to be discerned, much less understood, without an effort on the part of the narrator so to represent them that the reader is induced to comprehension, without undue discouragement.

From these conditions it results that military history divides naturally into three kinds. There is the simple chronicle, in which each event is narrated, ordinarily in order of time, as in a journal ; but also, unless it is intended as a mere reference table of dates, with sufficient extension of detail to make each transaction comprehensible in itself, though without reference to other matters or to the war at large. Of this kind of naval history, James's *History of the British Navy* is a notable example. It discards avowedly any pretense to philosophical treatment, or to explanation of the relations of events to each other. The action is divided under three principal heads,—Fleet Battles, Battles of Single Ships, and Colonial Expeditions. Each of these is given in chronological order ; and as the work, until recently, was not indexed, the perplexed student would at times spend raging hours seeking for some statement he was sure he had seen, but to whose whereabouts the arrangement gave no probable clue. The value of such a work depends chiefly upon its accuracy. It is raw material ; of no great use to the ordinary reader, until worked into some definite shape by a competent student.

At the other end of the scale is the more philosophical treatment, which regards the war as a whole, seeks to detect its stream of tendency, and to explain how each factor, each event, contributed to the general outcome. Such a view, though broad, is not necessarily vague in character ; but, in order to be distinct, it requires the elimination of a great deal of minor detail, which confuses the impression sought to be produced. This treatment is very purely intellectual ; its appeal to the emotions, as excited by the grand drama of war, is only incidental, and arises rather from the splendid nature of the subject itself than from the direct effort of the writer.

There remains a third method, that of the connected, all-embracing narrative, which omits nothing, unless it be the merest triviality, but nevertheless seeks the consistency and coherence of the well-told story, the interest of which is sustained throughout by the skill of the writer, handling his incidents as a novelist does the fortunes of his characters. It is to this class that Mr. Spears's *History of Our Navy* belongs ; and it is scarcely necessary to remark that to combine into a consistent whole the incidents of a century, omitting nothing of importance, yet maintaining the interest of the reader, is an exceedingly difficult task. There is no natural unity in the subject, beyond the fact that it deals with the Navy ; the various battles and other operations are so many *dramatis personae*, often unrelated to one another ; and, when the stage is crowded with figures, we

all know that, though interest may be momentarily aroused, it soon wearies, from the fact that the confusion makes comprehension a painful effort. Who can endure a constant procession of figures, except when draped in color and animated by music like a military parade? When the procession of worthy citizens in plain black, with curious badges, files monotonously by, the windows empty; and it is the same in history.

This is, of course, doubly true where the nature of the case makes the crowd of actions—or actors—individually commonplace; and until the time of the Civil War this was in great measure the case with the American Navy. The scale upon which the United States has constituted her sea forces—in the Revolution necessarily, and since that time deliberately—has made of her naval history mainly a series of single-ship actions, which are not easily to be understood by the non-professional reader; and what is not easily understood does not readily interest—as is the case with Browning as a poet and Meredith as a novelist. A great battle between fleets is a splendid episode, the salient or decisive features of which can generally be made clear, without much technical explanation; the prominent actors are few; their acts are frequently brilliant. Along with clearness there are color and animation. The theme possesses its own unity and its own interest, and lays, therefore, the lightest tax upon the author's powers of presentation. Where such episodes are frequent they lighten the whole, and the judicious skimmer, which the practised reader usually is, can travel from episode to episode without exhaustion. But at the very best it is hard to carry even such interest over the proceedings of a century. The greatest military history in the English language, Napier's *Peninsular War*, which magnificently combines philosophical breadth of treatment, minute technical discussion, and superb dramatic power, covers a period of six or seven years, and takes abundance of space in which to do so. Having thus ample room to explain adequately, and being at the same time provided by the nature of his subject with plentiful and rich material wherewith to decorate, he is enabled, with his own unusual powers of presentation, to engage at once the understanding and the heart of his readers, who are carried without conscious effort from scene to scene with the sensation of unbroken delight. A man capable of enjoyment in seeing clearly and feeling deeply will find few dull pages in Napier.

From these considerations it will appear that Mr. Spears, in attempting to present a century of naval history, even though so few years of that century have been years of naval war, has undertaken no slight task. In the matter of presentation, adequate to inform and interest a reader, it cannot be said that he has succeeded. There is a great lack of proportion in devoting only 522 pages, out of over 1850, to the Civil War. In order to compress the latter within the dimensions thus assigned to it, details of interest have to be ruthlessly cut off, sacrificing at once clearness of exposition and the interest which can only be obtained by a sufficient entry into detail, where detail exists. Readers must be permitted to linger a little over incidents, to enter somewhat into the daily expe-

rience of the actors in the incidents, or else they will neither understand nor care. As an instance, the bayou expeditions, as they were called, during Grant's operations before Vicksburg, afford material for graphic narrative, and they had also a definite object in view. True, they failed; they may even have been mistakes; but in excitement and picturesqueness they rank high among naval adventures, and the understanding of their purpose contributes materially to the comprehension of the Vicksburg campaign as a whole, both on the military and naval side. Mr. Spears barely mentions them.

It is doubtless in consequence of this necessity for extreme compression that the style of the author at this portion of his work bears apparent evidence of hurry. This most writers have felt as they approach the end of a long task, and especially if there has been anything perfunctory in its beginning, in its methods, or in its continuance. The author himself seems to share the precipitation of the reader, and the latter feels very much as if he were taken by the elbow and hurried along the shelves of a museum, while the catalogue of its contents is read aloud in transit. For this apparent haste Mr. Spears's profession as a journalist may account in part; but it is to be attributed chiefly to the original mistake, by which one-fourth of his space is allotted to three-fourths of the interest of his subject.

To the American Revolution 302 pages are given. The amount is not excessive; for the difficulties, the heroism, and the considerable influence exerted upon the general result by the predatory warfare, to which the Revolutionary seamen were driven, has never been adequately set forth. In this beginning of his work, the author shows little evidence of the haste so painfully perceptible towards the close. There are indeed some incidents that might well be omitted as, for instance, the prayer of the Scotch parson against Paul Jones' ships, Vol. I., p. 239, which is not a part of American naval history; and, where economy of space for better objects was so much needed, some of the easy-tongued abuse of Great Britain's action during the Revolution could be spared, as being, upon the whole, somewhat behind the date, and irrelevant to naval history, strictly so called. But the author shows a considerable amount of philosophic appreciation of the bearing of events, which causes regret that he did not exert his powers more adequately upon the later period of the Civil War. The unprofessional reader may gain a fair idea of the contribution of American seamen to the cause of their country's independence. In particular, the author's recognition of the importance and decisive effect of Arnold's campaign on Lake Champlain, in 1776, is most creditable to his insight. It would have been better still had he traced the sequence of cause and effect which justified his remark; but, although the comment had occurred independently to the present writer, he had never published it, and as far as he knows it is original with Mr. Spears.

The War of the Revolution and the War of the Rebellion are the two great military, as well as political, crises of the history of the United

States. In the popular appreciation of Americans, however, the War of 1812 is the great naval epic. Save the combats upon Lake Erie and Lake Champlain, there was no organized warfare, in the modern sense, upon the waters; but, as in the Homeric poems, interest is concentrated upon champions—single ships—with the intensity that easily gathers round the exhibition of personal valor. Mr. Spears evidently shares this prevalent sentiment, for to this theme he gives 725 pages—a volume and a half—of his total space. As a tribute to the navy of that day, in whose honor, as regards the qualities of its officers and men, too much cannot be said, this is not amiss; but if the object of naval history be not merely to fire the popular imagination, but to instruct the popular intelligence as to the value of sea forces, the relative proportions allotted to 1812 and to each of the two great struggles cannot be approved. The fact that there were no better officers nor braver men, the world over, than those who then took our frigates and sloops to sea, should never be allowed to obscure the lesson that our statesmen had so pitiful an appreciation of the necessity of a navy, that they brought the country to war practically powerless upon the ocean. But that knowledge is inevitably obscured, unless pains is taken to contrast the glory of the navy with the distress of the nation, whose ports and waters were blockaded with impunity because the navy was so weak; and an erroneous impression is conveyed, in the comparative importance attributed to the events of that war, by the greater space given to them, collectively and individually.

For instance, the momentous events occurring on the Mississippi, from Farragut's first passing the batteries of Vicksburg, June 28, 1862, to the surrender of Vicksburg, July 4, 1863, a period of twelve months, cover 27 numerical pages, of which 14 are given to full-page illustrations. In these thirteen remaining pages are comprised the following events: Farragut's passage of the batteries of Vicksburg, and his return past them; the daring dash of the Confederate *Arkansas*, and her action with the U. S. vessels; the bayou expeditions of the navy about Vicksburg; the capture of Arkansas Post by the navy; Ellet's raid up the Red River; the battle and capture of the *Indianola*; Farragut's passage by Port Hudson (which occupies just one page); Porter's passage of the batteries at Vicksburg and his battle at Grand Gulf (to these two together one page). The same space is given in the War of 1812 to the circumstances attending the action between the *Wasp* and the *Frolic*, two sloops of war of 450 tons. These cover 15 pages, from which two are deducted for a full-page illustration.

The portion of the work not touched upon so far gives an account of the wars with the Barbary States and with Mexico, of the putting down of piracy in the West Indies, and of the slave trade on the coast of Africa; with incidental mention of other naval matters of interest. These occupy the latter half of Volume III. Thirty pages at the end of the work are very properly devoted to a description of the present navy.

A. T. MAHAN.

Memoirs and Letters of James Kent, LL.D., Late Chancellor of the State of New York. By his great-grandson, WILLIAM KENT. (Boston: Little, Brown and Co. 1898. Pp. x, 341.)

A GOOD test of a biography is the impression which its perusal makes on a reader who is in or who puts himself into the attitude of ignorance with reference to its subject. One to whom Chancellor Kent's name was previously unknown, from these *Memoirs and Letters* may derive a very just opinion of the personality, studies, character, labors and standing of that distinguished jurist. As the work, apart from the appendix and index, consists of only 277 pages, it is obvious that the story of a life of eighty-four years is told concisely and without waste of detail, and yet it does not lack color or strength of lines.

The son of a clergyman, born in Dutchess County, N. Y., July 31, 1763, James Kent was graduated from Yale College in 1781, with the love of his classmates and the honors of scholarship, won in a course broken by the incidents of the War of the Revolution.

While in college the reading of Blackstone's *Commentaries* created in him the purpose to become a lawyer, and entering at once upon his studies for the profession, he began that course of systematic research into the standard law books, and liberal excursions, first in English, next into classic and especially into Latin literature, and then into French, to which he adhered through life. The number of the volumes, the variety of subjects, the diversity of the literature subjected, not simply to review, but to earnest study, expose the breadth of intellect, and the thoroughness of preparation which were to flower out into a masterly grasp of high themes and a diction of rare clearness, precision and force.

The methods of the future chancellor explain how in seven years, from the age of twenty-four to thirty-one, he was to accomplish so much. "In the morning till after eight," he says, "I read Latin, then Greek until ten. Then I gave myself up to law or business until the afternoon, and after two hours' attention to French, I concluded the rest of the day with some English author." From these methods came "pleasure and ardor," and "they opened to him a world of learning, of happiness and of fame."

This was the equipment of James Kent, a country lawyer, at Poughkeepsie, N. Y., when in 1793 he removed to New York city and the next year became a professor of law in Columbia College. He was poor, with little practice, and his lectures in the college, after the first course, failed to command attention, so that he soon resigned the professorship.

He had been in 1790 elected a member of Assembly from Dutchess County, and in 1793 he had been defeated in a canvass for representative in Congress by his brother-in-law, Theodorus Bailey. In 1796 he was returned to the Assembly from New York city. While his legislative career was respectable, he felt no zeal in it and no desire to prolong it.

On the contrary when Governor John Jay, who had in February, 1796, appointed him master in chancery, added a year later the appoint-

ment as recorder of the city of New York, he found employment entirely congenial to him, and in 1798 he became, to the satisfaction of his ambition, a judge of the Supreme Court of the state. In that position for sixteen years he achieved the highest reputation, by opinions carefully elaborated and written out in detail, then a novelty in that court, and in 1814 he was commissioned chancellor, when he at once applied his processes of thorough investigation and exhaustive discussion which raised the Court of Chancery to a plane which it had never before occupied.

The habits of wide and liberal study were not abandoned amid the cares and burdens of the supreme bench. In addition to the latest works on jurisprudence Judge Kent kept up the reading of Latin, French and English authors in many fields of literature, including history, philosophy, travels, biography and reviews. His selections were cosmopolitan, but if an opinion may be formed from his summary of the plays of Shakespeare, his critical acumen in the drama was not equal to his legal erudition.

The chancellor during his whole life was a Federalist, a champion of Washington, a particular friend of Hamilton, always opposed to Burr, a severe critic of John Adams, and still more, of course, of Jefferson. He was a familiar figure in the most select social circles of Albany and New York, and his acquaintance and correspondence extended to many eminent persons, notably Story, Webster and Everett.

Fortunate was the provision which made his retirement from the chancellorship compulsory at the age of sixty; for he was thus enabled to return to his office of professor in Columbia College, and to produce the lectures which became the basis of his *Commentaries on American Law*. These gave him a place in the front rank of American jurists, and served, when they first appeared, to introduce our lawyers and courts and decisions and legal learning to the favorable consideration of the old world. Expanded and annotated by the author, and after his death still sensibly edited, these *Commentaries* retain an esteemed place in law libraries at home and abroad.

The "Memories of Alexander Hamilton," printed as an appendix, serve to show the style and the politics of the chancellor.

While the career and labors of Chancellor Kent were not of the popular sort, these *Memoirs* illustrate how thoroughly he used all his talents, and they provide an example and an incentive, not only for professional men but for all, to make the most of time and to garner steadily at every moment the flower and the grain of literature. The book is thus healthy and inspiring, as it is well constructed, and without pretensions or fulsomeness; it is excellent in a high class of biography. Yet, singularly, the date of the death of the chancellor nowhere appears in its pages, an omission sure to be corrected in later editions.

ELLIS H. ROBERTS.

The Neutrality of the American Lakes and Anglo-American Relations.
By JAMES MORTON CALLAHAN, Ph. D. (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press. 1898. Pp. 199.)

MR. CALLAHAN'S study of our international relations on the northern lake border is published in the Johns Hopkins *Studies*. It is a book of nearly 200 pages, with wide margins and copious citations of sources. The introduction gives a general sketch of the American policy as to the neutralization of the lakes. The subsequent chapters deal with the lake boundary in the treaty of 1783, the struggle for supremacy in those waters and the adjacent regions (ending in 1815), the agreement of 1817, and the disturbances threatening the permanence of that agreement arising from the Canadian rebellion of 1837, our northeastern and northwestern boundary disputes, the Civil War, and the Fenian raids, and from various incidental causes. Finally it is shown how the agreement has been continued, and how beneficent have been its results.

Mr. Callahan's work is painstaking, and gives what seems to be an exhaustive sketch of the subject. In newspaper citations possibly he is a trifle too conscientious. How far public opinion is really reflected by newspaper editorials or communications is always an open question. At all events, the mere existence of such an article is slender evidence of anything beyond the editorial hope that it may be interesting to somebody.

The diction is occasionally careless. "Mr. Bagot could not be rushed" (p. 12), "The British general, McNabb, had Captain Drew to anchor two schooners" (p. 95), "Adams was led to suspicion that England was simply amusing the United States" (p. 79), are cases in point. Such expressions as "old musty maxims of diplomacy" (p. 19) and "notwithstanding occasional waves of jingoism" (p. 22-3) are mere cant. "Haldiman" (p. 37) is doubtless a misprint. The name is correct on p. 30. The American commissioners at Ghent in 1814 were not "ministers" (p. 51, note 2). However, these are trifling slips in a thorough piece of work.

The agreement of 1817 was a very sensible thing. It has saved mutual rivalry in expense, and, what is still more important, it has doubtless saved irritating friction. The parade of strong naval squadrons on the great lakes would be an absurdity. Naval power on salt water is a very different matter, for the ocean is the highway of the world. On the lakes, however, Great Britain and the United States are absolutely alone, and it would be ridiculous for the two nations to make naval faces at each other across these isolated fresh-water ponds.

The compact of 1817 has usually been called an "arrangement" or an "agreement," with the implication that it is not a treaty. The difference is, after all, not very easy to point out. The agreement received the assent of the British crown, which is all that is necessary to the validity of any treaty so far as Great Britain is concerned. To be sure effect was given to the arrangement by both governments without refer-

ence to the American Senate, on the assumption that it was a mere administrative agreement. But in April, 1818, President Monroe submitted the matter to the consideration of the Senate, and that body promptly ratified it. It would seem that such ratification was essential to the complete validity of the arrangement. One condition is that "If either party should be hereafter desirous of annulling this stipulation, and should give notice to that effect to the other party, it shall cease to be binding after the expiration of six months from the date of such notice." Now, of course, it is competent for any president to make an agreement with reference to a mutual disarmament, and he will then be bound in honor to carry it out. If a part of this agreement involves a six months' notice as a prerequisite to annulment, there is no doubt that this, too, he would be under moral obligation to maintain. But, surely, no such mere personal compact could be legally binding on any successor. No foreign government would be entitled to demand the six months' notice as an international right. To make such stipulation a legal obligation on the government of the United States it would be necessary that it be an agreement, not merely of the Executive, who is not empowered by the constitution to make compacts with foreign nations, but of the constitutional treaty-making power. In point of fact this has been done in case of the "agreement" of 1817. It was made by the President and confirmed by the Senate. That being the case, and, as has been seen, the agreement also having been ratified by the British treaty-making power, it would seem that the "arrangement," the "agreement" of 1817, is to all intents and purposes a treaty, and as such is legally binding on both parties.

HARRY PRATT JUDSON.

A Memoir of Robert C. Winthrop, 1809-1894, prepared for the Massachusetts Historical Society by ROBERT C. WINTHROP, JR. (Boston: Little, Brown and Co. 1897. Pp. vi, 358.)

Few men could be named in all that portion of our history in which he lived—save only the great characters of the war period itself—whose memoir will be welcomed by a greater number and variety of readers than that of Robert C. Winthrop. Rare indeed have been the men, distinguished in any sphere or specialty of active life, who have been permitted to labor on and win in it an abiding name, for the long years—well nigh three score and ten—which were the lot to the subject of this memoir. But his was no special work. Indeed what is written over his tomb at Mount Auburn, "Eminent as a Scholar, an Orator, a Statesman and a Philanthropist,—above all a Christian," does but faintly measure the full scope of his life-work, active to the end. Mr. Winthrop's personality, so unlike that of any other one who lived in his time in this country, was carried into everything he did, and into all his public career, making everything pertaining to him and his work especially interesting. This book is not his "Life" nor his "Works." They have been many years

before the public and have more than justified the inscription, which filial partiality might otherwise have been excused in appropriating. But this *Memoir* brings to the public notice, not the "Works" of Mr. Winthrop, but Mr. Winthrop in his work;—how, and under what conditions, what influences, passions, and in spite of what adverse winds and waves and currents he had worked, patiently and confidently awaiting the judgment of those who should come after him upon what he had been able to contribute to the public service.

Beyond his distinguished public career, during the most crucial period in our history, there cluster around the old historic name of Winthrop many rare characteristics so interwoven into the story of his own life as to render this book most attractive and interesting. He came of a stock born to be heard and felt among men, and who for more than two hundred years had been the counsellors of the people as they grew up from a ship-load of feeble emigrants to a great nation. He was the seventh in direct line from that John Winthrop, governor of the Massachusetts Colony more than two hundred and fifty years ago, whose statue, standing for his state, is the first on the right of the door as you pass into the National Statuary Hall at Washington, typifying in every lineament of feature and pose of figure, the brain and will power of the great leader he was. Pedigree counts for but little with us, but when strong traits of character follow blood as they sometimes do, and shape and color the career of men generation after generation, they help much in the study and estimate of men's lives. Especially is this true of the Winthrops. There was never lacking, in any one of the six generations between the founder of the family in this country, and Robert C. Winthrop, some one embodying in his person and in his place among his fellowmen those great traits of character and purposes of life that the first governor brought over from England and so signally illustrated in the early days of our colonial history. The reader of this book will find much in the public life of Mr. Winthrop traceable to this origin, which would be otherwise not easy of explanation, but, for this reason, all the more interesting and attractive.

Mr. Winthrop was destined from the outset for a political career, and was educated accordingly, just as others are educated for the ministry or the law, or to be physicians. And every possible opportunity that ample means and family pride could supply was given him for the most complete equipment. His oration at graduating, entitled "Public Station," had a political tinge, and, curiously enough, was charged with *sectionalism*, a charge which in one shape or another hovered around nearly all he did in after life. Quoting from the Psalms, he exclaimed with David, "Promotion cometh neither from the East, nor from the West, nor yet from the South." A distinguished Virginian in the audience, who was afterward Speaker of the House of Representatives and Minister to England, took this in high dudgeon as an insult to the South and ostentatiously refused, on that account, to attend a reception given the young orator by his father when the exercises were over. Thus at

the early age of nineteen, he came into public notice as a young orator of rare attainment and promise, and he so acquitted himself on frequent occasions afforded him in Faneuil Hall and other noted gatherings, as to win for him at the outset very high rank, as an effective and eloquent speaker, which he maintained with increasing reputation as long as he remained in public life.

He plunged at once into politics, toward which all his early training had been directed. He adopted without question or qualification the political creed of the old Whig party, then dominant in his native state and powerful in numbers and weight throughout the Union, as that creed was then expounded by its great leaders and at that time universally held by the rank and file. As it then stood he adhered to it to the very letter, unchanged as long as he acknowledged allegiance to any political organization. He would as soon have listened to a modification or interpolation into the Thirty-Nine Articles, as to any modification of the doctrine to which he had subscribed. "*The Constitution as it is, our Union as it is, our Territory as it is.*" This was to him the Law and the Prophets, and by it he judged all measures and all policies, while he continued in the public service, and in that interest with which he followed public affairs through life. No one will judge Mr. Winthrop justly who loses sight of this, to him, unchangeable rule of conduct. With a thorough knowledge of the perils out of which the Constitution had come into existence, it was his firm belief that it could safely encounter the new perils confronting it, only by maintaining it with all its covenants and compromises just as it came from the fathers. It was his firm conviction that in the storm that was gathering over slavery extension, attempts to either promote or check it by change or disregard of the organic law were equally hazardous, and should be frowned upon, in whatever guise they came. No other interpretation of the creed of the Whig party was held by any one at the time of Mr. Winthrop's adhesion to it, and any other always appeared to him full of peril. He took at once a leading part in its deliberations and work, and became its pet and idol. He had hardly reached thirty years of age when he had been six years a member of the Massachusetts Legislature, and three of these the Speaker of the House, then consisting of more than five hundred members, and had been elected to Congress, of which he soon became the presiding officer. The highest honors of the republic seemed within his reach.

Mr. Winthrop's ability and attainments fully justified his rapid rise. As a classical scholar, as a graceful and eloquent speaker, as well as powerful debater replete with knowledge of all history, his influence in the public counsels made him prominent before all other aspirants for public distinction. His speeches in Congress, and at noted times while he was in the public service, and especially his addresses and orations on rare occasions after his retirement, already before the public in the four volumes of *Addresses and Speeches* published during his lifetime, are of inestimable value to every public man as a reference on all great questions

which have arisen for discussion within the last fifty years. They are a record of views and conclusions on the gravest of issues, which will stand the test of subsequent examination in the light of accomplished facts, with less qualification than that left behind by any of his contemporaries.

But this *Memoir* has been published the rather to reveal the real inner man of one who brought to the public service great ability, rare gifts, and a pure and ardent patriotism, at a period in our history so surcharged with passions and prejudices as to render a just judgment of the motives of those who differed from current opinion well-nigh impossible. The time has been well chosen, and the work admirably done. Time has taken the false coloring out of acts that once seemed equivocal, and has brought to the clearer and juster judgment of men efforts to avert a gathering storm, the fearful consequences of which an over-ruling Providence has averted. The public can look with more calmness and with a juster balance now than in the heat of the war upon differences about the best methods of averting it or of bringing it to a successful issue. And the son has in this book, with admirable temper and candor, laid before the public the inner purposes and struggles of his distinguished father to ward off national perils no one could measure, and which, as he saw the light, dim at best, were sometimes seriously aggravated by indiscretions of others equally patriotic. But when the war came, and debate had closed, how grandly does this *Memoir* reveal the real character of Mr. Winthrop. It is all told in a single incident. No two men differed more widely as to the line of duty, up to the first gun at Sumter, than Henry Wilson and Mr. Winthrop. But these two men forgot all differences when, on Boston Common, Winthrop presented to Wilson's regiment, in words that stirred the blood in every patriotic heart, the flag it was to follow and fight for. Those who fought for the Union had no more efficient or constant supporter than this statesman, whose efforts to avert a conflict had relegated him to private life.

But this true patriot did not sulk in his tent on his enforced retirement, but still with untiring assiduity devoted himself to the public service. In every possible way during the war, he contributed to the efficiency and care of the army in the field. And after the war was over, all the remainder of his days were full of efforts to build up the waste places, and re-establish the grandeur of the Union. The record of his work for a quarter of a century in the administration of the Peabody fund, of the oft-repeated appeals in behalf of the poor and ignorant brought into citizenship by the social upheavals of the war, his grand contributions to the patriotic literature of the country during this period, in his centennial addresses at Bunker Hill and Yorktown, at the completion of Washington's monument, and on other noted occasions, are a legacy to coming generations of priceless value.

This book was written for the Massachusetts Historical Society, as a memorial of one who had been its president for thirty years, that there might be left on its records a tribute to his great worth and work. It is more. It is the tribute of a son, loyal to a good name of which he is

justly proud, giving coloring enough to win for him the respect of every generous reader. It sets down nothing in malice, nor exaggerates any claim, but the story is told in a style which has just enough flavor of the old Winthrop wine to make it attractive. It has been well done and the general reader cannot afford to miss it.

HENRY L. DAWES.

The Old Santa Fé Trail; The Story of a Great Highway. By Colonel HENRY INMAN, late Assistant Quartermaster, United States Army. (New York and London: The Macmillan Company. 1898. Pp. xvi, 493.)

FIFTY years ago passage across "the plains" between the Missouri River and the mountains was made by one of two routes: the Oregon trail by the Platte River valley and the Santa Fé trail by the Arkansas. The former or northern was the route of emigrants intending to settle on the Pacific coast, in Oregon chiefly, for gold had not then been discovered in California and emigrants from the East had not been attracted to that region. The southern or Santa Fé trail was mainly a route of trade, by which all the region of New Mexico was supplied with articles not produced there and returned in payment the furs of the mountains, the buffalo skins of the plains, the gold of the placer mines and the silver of Mexico. A few emigrants took the southern trail and some traffic the northern, and each was familiar to the hunters, trappers and Indian traders of the mountain region.

Between these routes Parkman hesitated for a moment before starting on the expedition of which he has left that fascinating narrative, the first of his published works, *The Oregon Trail*. For his purpose he of course decided wisely in favor of the northern route. He wished to see and study the Indian as nearly as was then possible in his primitive condition. The Dakotahs, Crows, Blackfeet and other tribes of the North had scarcely seen white men, except the half-wild hunters and trappers who frequented their country, and their character or customs had not appreciably changed since the time when this continent was unknown to the rest of the world. The Comanches, Arrapahoes, Apaches, Navahoes and other southern tribes had been for generations or even for centuries more or less in contact with white people, and, though still essentially savage, had been more or less superficially influenced by them. Yet for most adventurous travelers, seeking new and strange scenes and incidents, the Santa Fé trail had superior attractions. Trade is commonly esteemed prosaic, but this form of traffic had in it enough of novelty and variety of scene, person, incident and danger to remove it beyond the region of the commonplace and give it a flavor of romance quite unlike anything to be found in the business of ordinary life in our country and time.

The great highway, broad and well worn by travel, stretching out for eight hundred miles through a vast expanse of level or gently rolling prairie, seeming to the eye as boundless as the ocean, with no landmarks

to be approached and passed, no dwelling of man near it, no other roads meeting or crossing it, not even a tree or bush to be seen for days together, was impressive in its way, and the grand monotony of the prairie, whether bright with fresh herbage and gay with flowers in the spring or gray and sombre under the fierce dry heat of the late summer or early autumn, was sometimes exhilarating, sometimes depressing.

The long train of heavy wagons, transformed each evening into a fort for protection against possible Indian attacks, the varied company of traders, adventurers, drivers, mountain men, Yankees, Missourians, creoles, French and Spanish, half-breeds and Indians, the vast herds of buffalo, the inevitable nightly serenade of coyotes, their shrill clamor interrupted occasionally by the long mournful howl of the larger "lover" wolf, the appearance now and then of Indian parties, hostile if their numbers or the carelessness of the caravan gave them an opportunity to stampede the stock or attack the train or camp with some hope of success, or ostensibly friendly if the conditions constrained them to appear so—all these sights and sounds and incidents were full of novelty and interest to the observer from the East; he seemed to be transferred to another age and to share with the early travelers and explorers the delight of discovery of new lands, new peoples and new manners.

Colonel Inman, whose book has suggested these remarks, seems to have made his personal acquaintance with the Santa Fé trail after it had lost something of its oriental and medieval aspect. But the traditions of its earlier times were fresh and abundant. He has collected many of them and relates them in a somewhat desultory but agreeable fashion. He had also the advantage and has used it, of course with suitable acknowledgment, of Josiah Gregg's book, *Commerce of the Prairies*, published in 1845, now long out of print and somewhat scarce, which is by far the most complete and authentic account of the early Santa Fé trade and of the province of New Mexico before its acquisition by the United States. For the earliest notices of this trail and of the region crossed by it, Colonel Inman seeks the usual sources. He has mention of Cabeça de Vaca, of De Soto and Coronado, who in the sixteenth century traversed some portion of this region. He thinks that Coronado's route had its terminus near the great bend of the Arkansas. It seems to me more probable that his town of Quivira, the farthest point eastward reached by his expedition, was on the Kansas River not far from the present site of Lawrence.

Colonel Inman's book can scarcely be called a history, though it contains much historical matter and is full of anecdotes, descriptions and biographical sketches of men famous on the frontier in their day, as scouts, traders, or hunters, all of which, besides their interest as tales of adventure and peril, have value as illustrations of history.

For one who has a taste for tales of daring and perilous adventure it would be hard to find more pleasant matter for desultory reading than these anecdotes of such daring pioneers, scouts, mountain men, and early traders as Ezekiel Williams, William and Charles Bent, Kit Carson, Col.

Cody, St. Vrain and others. Colonel Inman himself had some thrilling experiences which he tells with spirit and modesty. On the whole, the book, though unsystematic and a little disappointing to one who expects facts arranged in an orderly narrative, was well worth writing, and the men now living who could have written it so well with so much personal knowledge of its scenes and characters are not many.

J. EVARTS GREENE.

Essays on the Civil War and Reconstruction and Related Topics. By WILLIAM ARCHIBALD DUNNING, Ph.D., Professor of History in Columbia University. (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1898. Pp. ix, 376.)

THE Civil War produced a rank and rapid growth of constitutional interpretations. The problems were new, the Constitution untried and the extremity seemed dire. President Lincoln and Congress found ready to hand as rules of interpretation the doctrines of implied powers and reasonable construction ("that which will give efficacy and force to a government, rather than that which will impair its operations and reduce it to a state of imbecility," *Story*). They used them freely.

The cases of constitutional interpretation in the Civil War and Reconstruction period are treated in the first five of the seven essays before us. Essay I., *The Constitution of the United States in Civil War*, discusses those acts of the President and Congress relating to the conduct of the war which involve new or questionable powers. Essay II., *The Constitution of the United States in Reconstruction*, treats of the relation of the seceded states and their inhabitants to the national government. The conclusion is that "private rights must be determined . . . on the theory that a state cannot perish;" but the "precedents of political action may and probably will be regarded as much more consistent with" the state-suicide and conquered-province theories of Sumner and Stevens. In the territory in insurrection the national government stood at the close of the war supreme above every other authority and obligated by the Constitution to protect life, liberty and property and to guarantee a republican form of government. The former obligation it met by establishing the military government, which acted sometimes through the state governments and sometimes in spite of them (Essay III., *Military Government during Reconstruction*); and the latter by the construction of a "new political people" and its organization into states under the supervision of the military power (Essay IV., *The Process of Reconstruction*). This was the work of Congress alone, acting by a two-thirds majority that was sometimes factitious. But if in time of war the executive can become a despot, says Professor Dunning, in the view of constitutional history the impeachment and trial of President Johnson (Essay V.) "must be considered as marking the utmost limit of the sharp reaction which followed the sudden and enormous concentration of power in the

executive department during the stress of arms . . . The single vote by which Andrew Johnson escaped conviction marks the narrow margin by which the presidential element in our system escaped destruction." A few of the precedents treated in the course of these essays have been confirmed by the judiciary ; more have been incorporated into the Constitution by amendment ; the rest stand on the authority of the department that made them.

It is evident from the style and method of treatment that Professor Dunning has thoroughly familiarized himself with the documentary evidence on the period. But the work of the historical laboratory is not done over in the presence of the reader. His results are succinctly stated. The temper in which he writes is wholesome. Citations and references are meagre ; still on the main point, which is always to present the constitutional aspect of the act or decision rather than to discuss the method by which it was actually reached, he will rarely fail to carry conviction by what he says. To the teacher and the student his work will afford valuable and timely help in the further study of the period. To the general reader he will prove interesting, unless the very narrowness of his constitutional point of view should disappoint.

Professor Dunning is forced to admire the process of reconstruction "as a demonstration of political and administrative capacity ;" but he criticizes its purpose and questions the political wisdom of various important acts. That such opinions should be but incidentally expressed in essays that ought to have the word "constitutional" worked into their collective title illustrates the author's singleness of purpose. But it also suggests that he is equipped with the material to elaborate in another and perhaps larger work some very interesting conclusions on some of the great questions of political expediency that arose in this period.

The last essay, of thirteen pages, on American Political Philosophy, is out of place in this collection and insipid in comparison. The last but one : *Are the States Equal under the Constitution?* is pertinent and timely, but not so satisfactory as the five preceding. It is easy to show that the inequalities are not so great as might appear at first. It is very easy to show, however, that unequal conditions have been laid on some states, that they have been operative and that the courts have enforced them (cf. two land cases in the reports of the U. S. Circuit Court, *Turner vs. Am. Baptist Missionary Union*, 5 McLean 344, and *Thompson vs. Holton*, 6 McLean 386). Still the Supreme Court has repeatedly declared the principle of the equality of the states. Professor Dunning concludes alternatively that if the relation of the United States to the individual states in respect to the terms of admission is a political question, "as there seems to be good reason" to believe, "the theory that all states have equal powers must be regarded as finally defunct ; if it is not, the theory can only be galvanized into life by a powerful act of judicial construction ;" and it is not easy to find evidence in rebuttal. Yet it seems a fair criticism to ask for a fuller presentation of the supporting cases which the author must have in his notes.

The ten reconstructing states are prohibited from narrowing the electorate on any ground. Mississippi and South Carolina have openly defied the acts of Congress. Mississippi claimed equality with the other states. South Carolina seems to have ignored the restoring act looking simply to the fifteenth amendment. "Practically this distinction has disappeared." Will Congress save its right by repealing the distinction on the ground that it is inexpedient to enforce it? or will it continue in abeyance until the Court has occasion to remove it on the broad ground that unequal conditions are unconstitutional? Here is a question from the reconstruction period that is alive and unsettled.

FREDERICK W. MOORE.

The Finances of New York City. By EDWARD DANA DURAND.
(New York: The Macmillan Company. 1898. Pp. vii, 397.)

To an ancient Hindoo maxim, "Without treasure there is no reigning," Burke gave a modern form and smack in the oft-quoted epigram, "The revenue of the state is the state." The principle was, of course, good for the ancient city, which was itself the state, and may apply with but slight qualifications to the modern city, which is but part of the state.

The story of a city may be written in that of its fisc. The interest of such a work as that before us is, therefore, not confined to those who concern themselves about the mere financing of a single city or of many. It has lessons for all who desire the betterment of urban life generally. Whether for the limited or the general purpose, no better subject could be taken in hand than the finances of our metropolitan city, already aspiring to the leadership of the world.

Selecting as his main purpose the exhibition of the finances of New York, as they are and are to be, the author sketches but briefly their past history in order to discover there the germs of present and future development. In a single short chapter he compresses a period reaching from the middle of the seventeenth century to the notable epoch of 1830. It is true that the events of this period are of antiquarian interest only, but in it are found the beginnings of such institutions and phenomena as the general property tax, special assessments, legislative meddling, city debt, and a sinking fund. Throughout this period of nearly two hundred years the city was governed and administered by its Council, very much as the English cities now are.

The Charter of 1830 was framed upon the so-called federal plan, but the Council continued to keep a large part of administrative duties in the hands of its committees. A leading feature of the charter was the provision for a budget drawn up by the controller, approved by the Council, and submitted to the state legislature for its final action. In this second period, closing with 1849, the Croton water-works were constructed, which together with a few other and minor projects brought the city debt up to nearly fourteen millions.

In the third period, 1850 to 1869, during which the city was under the rule of the state legislature through "commissions," we find the debt increased to nearly forty-five millions, with an eight-fold increment of annual expenditure. A brief account of the Tweed Ring and of the political events culminating in the charter of Greater New York completes the historical part of the book and opens the way to the main subject. The author ventures the opinion that the combination of governing principles in the new charter will prove unworkable. He evidently favors "genuine council government."

After some show of a theoretical scheme the author proceeds in a practical way to treat, first, of the revenue; next, of expenditure; then, of the city debt. A final chapter on accounts and auditing will be of value to officials and experts.

The three revenue chapters, on taxation, special assessments, and returns from city property and franchises offer nothing novel and little that is instructive or encouraging. There is the same old story of the evasion of the personal property tax, of the vacation and non-collection of assessments, and the virtual exemption of franchises capitalized for untold millions, from taxation.

The two chapters on the city expenditure and the city debt are perhaps better worked out than any of the others. It is a curious historical outcome that the preparation of the budget is still entrusted to a "board of estimate" first organized by Tweed and perpetuated since with but slight changes in personnel and powers. The common council of Greater New York have virtually no voice in determining the destination of the eighty millions of revenue to be annually demanded. That the vast debt of the city (nearly \$200,000,000) which includes a large part of the Tweed legacy, imposes a *per capita* charge of only \$60 is a matter for congratulation. The history of the sinking fund of New York would be an excellent subject for a separate monograph.

The author of this book has fulfilled his modest task with credit. That he made diligent studies on the ground and in the local records, there is plenty of evidence. The book is well made, the plan is good, there is a bibliography, some useful tables, several ingenious illustrations, diagrams and an excellent index. There is no pretence of fine writing, in itself a great merit. The adjective "considerable" is somewhat overworked. No author could expect a work of this kind to be "a possession forever."

Recurring to the idea suggested at the opening of this notice, it may finally be said that Mr. Durand may have rendered a greater service than he proposed to himself.

WILLIAM W. FOLWELL.

Part XVI. of Dr. Reginald Lane Poole's *Historical Atlas of Modern Europe* (Clarendon Press) contains, first, a map of Europe in 1740, based on the Spruner-Menke map (but on which we note *Rzywick* and *Millhausen*). Next follows an interesting map of England and Wales before

the Norman Conquest, by Mr. W. H. Stevenson, on which, by an ingenious variation of typography, Anglo-Saxon names taken from Bede, Latin names taken from Bede, Celtic names, and names derived from the Chronicle and other sources are distinguished one from another. A list of the local names, with their modern representatives, is given. The third map in this part is one prepared by Mr. Hugh E. Egerton, which exhibits European explorations and colonies from the fifteenth to the seventeenth century. It represents Guiana as extending up to and along the south side of the Orinoco for about two hundred miles from its mouth. There are inset maps which show the North American colonies, the West Indies, the Guinea coast and the Indian Archipelago after the Dutch conquests, on a scale larger than that of the main map. The first of these places Hartford a dozen miles from the Connecticut, New York on the west side of the Hudson, Jamestown on the south side of James River, and gives Baltimore the date of 1632 for its foundation.

Part XVII. contains, first, a map of England intended to serve for the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, but especially representing the conditions of 1654, and the rearrangement of seats in Parliament effected by the Instrument of Government, in order to indicate approximately the distribution of population and property in the middle of the seventeenth century. London and its environs are shown on an enlarged scale. This map has been prepared by the editor, who has also co-operated with Miss Dorothea Ewart in the production of the next map. This shows the ecclesiastical divisions of Italy in the Middle Ages, with special maps of the Roman suburbicarian bishoprics and of the city of Rome with its ecclesiastical arrangements. The last map, by Mr. Egerton, is one which, upon Mercator's projection, shows the European colonies and dependencies from 1815 to 1897, and the states of that period independent of European powers. It is, like all the other maps described, well designed and beautifully executed; but it is unfortunate in assigning the region now covered by the two Dakotas, Montana and Wyoming to the Oregon territory, rather than to the Louisiana cession.

The first *Abtheilung* of the eighth volume of Dahn's *Koenige der Germanen* is a brief sketch of Frankish political history from 613 to 843, making a thin pamphlet of 108 pages. Nearly one-half of this space—46 pages—is given to the thirty years from 813 to 843, so that the first two hundred years receive very summary treatment. This division of space is made because of the author's more detailed treatment of the history to the death of Charlemagne in his *Urgeschichte*, to which constant reference is made. The whole is, however, scarcely narrative history, but rather a commentary on the events, and a statement of the results of the author's special studies and of his always decided and uncompromising opinions. Charlemagne, for example, displayed little originality. His work in all directions was to complete what his predecessors had begun. His wars were not due to political foresight, or to any unusual statesmanship. The great motive in the Saxon war was religious, the

expansion of Christianity. The effect of his work was to break up the old Frankish state and to produce results against which he would himself have striven most earnestly had he foreseen them. And yet he is rightly called the Great, and was a ruler of extraordinary genius. In addition to the clear statement which it gives of Dahn's own conclusions, the book will be found very useful for the frequent references to recent special studies, with the author's reasons for agreement or disagreement.

The *Annual Report of the American Historical Association* for 1896 has lately appeared. It is made up in two volumes, of which the second, Professor Ames's essay on Amendments to the Constitution, calls for more detailed notice at a later time. The first volume is a portly tome of 1313 pages, far too large for the convenience of most readers, but containing an unusually large proportion of valuable matter. We do not pretend to give an exhaustive review of its varied contents, beginning with Dr. Storrs's graceful inaugural address and ending with Gen. Greely's laborious list of the publications of the first two Congresses. Professor E. G. Bourne's paper on Ranke would seem to every reader deserving of special mention in even the briefest summary. Dr. Herbert Friedenwald's elaborate, and apparently definitive, account of the journals and papers of the Continental Congress is distinctly of that sort of material of which the Association should seek to bring out more and more; and it must increase public appreciation of the importance of the papers of that congress still unpublished, and the desire of historians that more of them be put into print. Professor Haynes contributes an interesting sketch of the activities of a Know-nothing legislature. The extended discussions of the problems of method in the teaching of history, here printed verbatim, naturally lack somewhat in strictness of form; but those who heard the many instructive things said on that occasion will be glad to have a chance to encounter some of the suggestions again, and to think them over at leisure. Professor F. J. Turner's paper on the West as a field for historical study is exceedingly suggestive, and is accompanied with Mr. Bradley's bibliography of Northwestern materials. Bibliographical work on the part of the Association happily increases. Mr. Friedenwald's paper on the journals of the Continental Congress and Professor Bourne's on Ranke have excellent accompaniments of this sort. Of other papers, we note Dr. Libby's plea for the study of votes in Congress on a systematic plan, that of Professor G. B. Adams on the influence of the American Revolution on England's government of her colonies, and that of Dr. E. C. Burnett on the history of the government of federal territories in Europe. The report of the Historical Manuscripts Commission follows, comprising, indeed, a large part of the volume.

NOTES AND NEWS

Although the greatness of Mr. Gladstone as a public man stands foremost in public recollection since his death (on May 19), and although history was only one of the many fields of intellectual activity in which his extraordinary mental energies exercised themselves, it is proper for a historical journal to contribute its part to his commemoration by calling to remembrance his three historical books, *Studies on Homer and the Homeric Age* (1858), *Juventus Mundi* (1869) and *Homeric Synchronism* (1876), books which, though many of their main propositions have not commended themselves ultimately to the professional experts in ancient history, yet showed great learning and an ingenious and powerful mind. History had also a large share in the volumes of reprinted essays, *Gleanings of Past Years*, which Mr. Gladstone published in 1879.

Sir John T. Gilbert, who died on May 23, was born in Dublin in 1829. From 1867 to 1875 he was secretary to the Public Record Office of Ireland. He edited the four folio volumes of *Facsimiles of the National Manuscripts of Ireland* which the government published several years later. He was also the author of a *History of the City of Dublin* (1854-1859), a *History of the Viceroy of Ireland* (1865), a *History of Affairs in Ireland from 1641 to 1652* (1879-1881), and a *History of the Irish Confederation and the War in Ireland from 1641 to 1649* (seven volumes, 1882-1890). He was knighted in 1897.

Col. G. B. Malleison, C. S. I., one of the most noted and scholarly writers on Indian history, author of a *History of the French Empire in India*, of more than one work upon the Indian Mutiny, and of the volumes on Akbar, Clive and Dupleix in the *Rulers of India* series, died on March 1, aged 72.

August Potthast, formerly librarian of the German Reichstag, and author of two well-known books, indispensable to the student of medieval history, *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum inde ab a. 1198 ad a. 1304* (1874) and *Bibliotheca Historica Medii Aevi* (1862, last ed. 1896) died at Leobschütz, Prussia, on February 13.

Rt. Rev. William Stevens Perry, bishop of the Protestant Episcopal diocese of Iowa, died in Dubuque on May 11. He was born in Providence in 1832, and was graduated from Harvard College in 1854. After having been minister of various churches and president and professor of church history at Hobart College, he was elected bishop of Iowa in 1876. For many years he was the official historiographer of the Episcopal Church, and the most important of his many publications had to do with its history. The chief among these have been an edition of the *Journals of the Conventions of the Protestant Episcopal Church* (1861); *Documentary History of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America* (1863-1864);

Historical Collections of the American Colonial Church (1871-1878); and a *History of the American Episcopal Church* (1885), of which the successive chapters were written by various hands, under his editorial supervision. The bishop's services have been particularly eminent in the bringing to light of documents in England bearing on the history of his church in America.

Hon. William H. Trescot died on May 4. He was born in Charleston, S. C., in 1822. In 1860 he was assistant secretary of state, and from 1877 to 1882 he was almost constantly employed by the United States government in special diplomatic missions. He published in 1852 a valued volume on the *Diplomacy of the Revolution*, which he followed in 1857 with a *Diplomatic History of the Administrations of Washington and Adams*.

Col. J. Thomas Scharf, who died on February 28, at the age of 55, was the author of four useful books of Maryland history: *Chronicles of Baltimore* (1874), a *History of Maryland* (1879), a *History of Baltimore City and County* (1881), and a *History of Western Maryland* (1882). Of these his *History of Maryland*, in three volumes, remains the leading general history of the state. In 1887 he also published a *History of the Confederate States Navy*, in which he had been an officer. He also wrote histories of St. Louis, Philadelphia and Delaware (1884, 1884, 1888). Col. Scharf was a tireless and most successful collector of manuscript material relating to the history of the South. His collection is now the property of the Johns Hopkins University.

Rev. Joseph H. Allen, Unitarian clergyman, author of *Christian History in Three Great Periods* (1880-1882), died on March 20, aged 78.

An International Congress of History will be held at the Hague in September, when the Netherlands celebrate the majority and coronation of the Queen. The Minister of Foreign Affairs will be the honorary president; the actual presiding officer, M. de Maulde La Clavière, secretary of the Société d'Histoire Diplomatique of Paris. The congress will be opened on September 12. The subscription is fixed at twenty francs, or four dollars. The papers read, which may be written in any language, will be printed and distributed to the members. The chairman of the local committee is M. Asser, councillor of state. Mr. James Gustavus Whiteley, of 223 West Lanvale Street, Baltimore, has been appointed to organize, and to preside over, the section of the United States.

The latest of the *Translations and Reprints of the Original Sources of European History* published by the University of Pennsylvania are: first, a translation of the canons of the four General Councils, edited by Professor Edwin K. Mitchell of the Hartford Theological Seminary; secondly, a series of documents illustrative of feudalism, edited by Professor E. P. Cheyney. The latter contains documents illustrating the origins of feudalism out of the relations of personal dependence, dependent land-tenure, and private jurisdiction, and thirty-odd documents illustrating

feudal institutions of later growth, followed by a slight bibliographical note. During the present year the historical department of the university intends to issue three publications larger than has been its wont: an edition of the Latin and Greek texts of the *Monumentum Ancyranum*, with an English translation, historical introduction, and notes; the remonstrance which the *Cour des Aides* presented to the king in 1775 during the ministry of Turgot; and a *Source-Book of the Italian Renaissance*, edited by Dr. Merrick Whitcomb.

The April number of the *Educational Review* contains a report on practical methods of teaching history presented to the New England History Teachers' Association by its committee, and discussion of the same by President Eliot; and a list of English sources for the teaching of history. The June number of the same periodical contains a suggestive article on the teaching of European history in colleges by Professor J. H. Robinson of Columbia.

Professor John W. Perrin of Allegheny College, Meadville, Penn., has been elected professor of history at Adelbert College, Cleveland.

Messrs. T. Y. Crowell and Co. announce the publication of a translation of Victor Duruy's *General History of the World*, edited by Professor E. A. Grosvenor of Amherst College.

ANCIENT HISTORY.

The Macmillan Co. will publish in four quarto volumes, commencing October, 1898, the *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, a dictionary of the Bible, edited by the Rev. T. K. Cheyne, Oriel Professor at Oxford and Canon of Rochester, and by Dr. J. Sutherland Black, assistant editor of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*.

The American excavations on the site of Corinth were resumed by Professor Richardson, director of the American School, on March 23. Pirene has been discovered. It is intended that the next efforts shall be made on the site of the agora, which is now thought to be completely determined. The new Austrian Institute, under the direction of Dr. Adolph Wilhelm, has begun exploration and excavation on the site of the temple of Artemis at Lusoi. The English School intends to excavate in Crete. The Prussian museums have decided on excavations at Miletus, and will make a beginning next autumn.

Bernhardus Bursy, *De Aristotelis Πολιτείας Ἀθηναίων partis alterius Fonte et Auctoritate* (Giurgevo, C. Mattiesen, pp. 148) attempts with much ability to maintain, against Wilamowitz, the view that the second part of the famous treatise is not derived from secondary materials, but directly from the original text of the constitutions and laws.

In a series of *Cornell Studies in Classical Philology*, No. VII. is a monograph on the Athenian Secretaries, by Mr. William S. Ferguson.

The next volume of the Egypt Exploration Fund (Græco-Roman branch), which may be expected by midsummer, will contain, besides

many fragments of classical and early Greek papyri, several fragments of Thucydides, of Herodotus, of Xenophon's *Hellenica*, of a chronological work giving the chief events from 356 to 316 B. C., and of a lost Roman historian.

In the *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique*, XXI., 1-8, M. Perdrizet, in an article on *Proxènes Macédoniens à Delphes*, derives from the Delphic inscriptions important conclusions regarding the early history and geography of Macedonia, and respecting the Grecian coast-cities absorbed by Philip.

In the May-June number of the *Revue Historique*, Dr. W. Liebenam begins a general survey of the German and Austrian publications in Roman history during the years 1894-1895.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Sir H. H. Howorth, *The Early History of Babylonia*, II. (*English Historical Review*, April); E. W. Hopkins, *Ancient and Modern Hindu Gilds* (*Yale Review*, May); R. Pöhlmann, *Die Anfänge des Sozialismus in Europa* (*Historische Zeitschrift*, LXXX. 3).

MEDIEVAL HISTORY.

Parts of the poem of Ambrose on the Third Crusade, *Histoire de la Guerre Sainte*, were printed in 1885 in the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores*, Vol. XXVII., but the whole had never been printed. M. Gaston Paris has now printed a complete edition of the poem, with an abundant apparatus. It appears to be proved that Books II. to VI. of the well-known *Itinerarium Regis Ricardi* are a mere translation from the poem of the *jongleur* Ambrose. The first book of the London canon is derived from the same source as Ambrose, rather than directly from the latter.

In the Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études (Sciences Religieuses) fasc. 9, M. Picaret presents a masterly study of the intellectual and religious life of Pope Sylvester II.—*Gerbert, un Pape Philosophe d'après l'Histoire et d'après la Légende* (Paris, Leroux).

MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY.

M. Albert Waddington has completed his careful and scholarly work on *La République des Provinces-Unies, la France et les Pays-Bas Espagnols de 1630 à 1650*, by the publication of the second volume (Paris, Masson, pp. 433), which extends from 1642 to 1650.

A translation of Seignobos' *Political History of Modern Europe*, edited by Professor S. M. Macvane, of Harvard University, is announced by Messrs. Henry Holt and Co.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: H. E. Dosker, *John of Barneveldt, Martyr or Traitor* (*Presbyterian and Reformed Review*, April); H. Havelock, *The Cossacks in the Early Seventeenth Century* (*English Historical Review*, April).

GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

Sir William Fraser, who had previously published a sumptuous book on the Johnstones, earls and marquises of Annandale, has prepared for the *Fifteenth Report of the Historical Manuscripts Commission* (Appendix, Part IX.) a calendar of the manuscripts of J. J. Hope Johnstone, Esq., of Annandale. The collection embraces, among other papers, a series of early charters, a large number of royal and other official letters of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and the correspondence of the first Marquis of Annandale and of his brother-in-law, the eighteenth earl of Crawford.

The Commission has also issued its first volume of *Reports on Manuscripts in the Welsh Language*, edited by Mr. Gwenogvryn Evans. This volume is devoted to the manuscripts of Lord Mostyn at Mostyn Hall. Especially noteworthy among them is a history of England and Wales, by Ellis Griffith, a soldier at Calais and an eye-witness of many interesting events *temp.* Henr. VIII.

Sir James H. Ramsay, whose *Lancaster and York* appeared a few years ago, is now about to publish a work in two volumes, entitled *Foundations of England*, in which he will treat of the portions of English history anterior to 1399. The book will be published by Messrs. Swan, Sonnenschein and Co.

In view of the approaching celebration of the thousandth anniversary of King Alfred's death, Miss Mary Rosamond Earle, of Newnham College, is preparing an edition of all his writings.

Professor W. Lewis-Jones, of the University College of North Wales, is engaged on an exhaustive study of the Arthurian legend, preparatory to issuing an edition of the oldest text of Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia Britonum*.

Major Martin A. S. Hume's *The Great Lord Burghley: a Study in Elizabethan Statecraft* will be issued in the autumn by Messrs. James Nisbet and Co.

Sir James Marwick, town clerk of Glasgow, the originator of the Scottish Burghs Record Society and editor of most of its publications, has just completed a work which will probably form the last to be issued by the Society. This work traces the constitutional history of the city from its origin to the year 1650.

The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge is publishing *Two Hundred Years: The History of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1698-1898*, by Rev. W. O. B. Allen and Rev. Edmund M'Clure, the secretaries of the society. The work is largely based on the records, letter-books, reports and minutes of the society since its foundation, and will throw much light on the history of the Church of England during the eighteenth century, the early history of the plantations in America, and the emigration of the Salzburg exiles.

The Scottish History Society has just published *The Journals and Papers of John Murray of Broughton*, who was secretary to Prince Charles Edward during the time of the Jacobite rising of 1745, edited by Mr. R. Fitzroy Bell. The Society will also publish the *Account-Book* (note-book or diary) of *Bailie David Wedderburne*, merchant of Dundee, 1580-1630.

The Nelson papers, chiefly descending from Lady Nelson, which *Literature* has brought to public notice, are continued in the issues for March 23, April 6, April 20, and May 4, and apparently concluded.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: A. Snow, *Craft Guilds in the Fifteenth Century* (Dublin Review, April); *English Jesuits and Scottish Intrigues, 1581-82* (Edinburgh Review, April).

FRANCE.

A French annual "Poole's Index" is being prepared by M. D. Joordel, and will be published at Paris by Nilsson. It will be entitled *Répertoire Bibliographique des principales Revues françaises pour l'Année*, —and will comprise an author- and subject-index to the articles in 142 French periodicals.

The second volume of M. P. Viollet's *Histoire des Institutions Politiques et Administratives de la France* (Paris, Larose), presents an admirable summary of the history of French institutions from the tenth to the sixteenth century, dealing with royalty and the administrative organs which surrounded it, with the church and the clergy, and with the nobility.

In the *Collection de Textes pour servir à l'Enseignement de l'Histoire* (Paris, Picard), M. A. Bouillet publishes the *Liber Miraculorum S. Fidis*, invaluable for the social and economic history of southern France in the eleventh century. The text is from a Schlettstadt manuscript, with collation of eight others, and the edition is scholarly.

An important study of the intellectual life of the twelfth century is presented by M. A. Dieudonné in his recent book called *Hildebert de Savardin, évêque du Mans, archevêque de Tours, sa Vie, ses Lettres* (Paris, Picard, pp. 303), based upon a critical recension of the very interesting letters of that prelate.

We are able to be more precise than in our last number with respect to Denifle and Chatelain's *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis*. The fourth volume having contained simply the texts relative to the internal history of the university during the years from 1394 to 1452, the fifth will present those of the same period which relate to the Great Schism and the ecumenical councils of the fifteenth century and to the affairs of Wyclif, the Hussites and Jean Petit. The second volume of the *Auctarium* has been published and contains the continuation of the book of the proctors of the English (German) nation from 1406 to 1466.

Out of the abundant archives of La Roche-Guyon, M. E. Rousse has composed an instructive and faithful picture of provincial feudal society in the last days of French feudalism, *Une Famille Féodale aux XI^e et XVI^e Siècles: Les Scilly, Seigneurs de la Roche-Guyon* (Paris, Hachette).

M. de Félice adds to his excellent treatise on the Huguenots, *Les Protestants d'autrefois, Vie intérieure des Églises, Mœurs et Usages*, a second volume (Paris, Fischbacher, pp. 368) especially devoted to the pastors, their characteristics and the circumstances of their life, all treated upon the basis of minute and learned researches.

One of the most noted of the French economists of the last century, but one of whose life little has hitherto been known, was Claude Vincent de Gournay, merchant, marquis and *intendant du commerce*. M. G. Schelle has now printed an adequate life of him, *Vincent de Gournay* (Paris, Guillaumin, pp. 300).

The most notable recent book of Napoleonic history would appear to be M. Arthur Chuquet's *La Jeunesse de Napoléon: Brienne* (Paris, Armand Colin, pp. 494), which is in a sense a continuation, at least a natural consequence, of his eleven volumes on *Les Guerres de la Révolution*.

M. Saige, archivist to the Prince of Monaco, has published an interesting and valuable general history of that small independent state, *Monaco, ses Origines et son Histoire, d'après les Documents Originaux* (Paris, Hachette).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Abbé Vacandard, *Les Élections Épiscopales sous les Mérovingiens* (*Revue des Questions Historiques*, April); P. Imbart de la Tour, *Les Paroisses Rurales dans l'Ancienne France*, III. (*Revue Historique*, May); P. Fournier, *Vies de Chartres et le Droit Canonique*, II. (*Revue des Questions Historiques*, April); H. Pirenne, *Villes, Marchés et Marchands au Moyen Âge* (*Revue Historique*, May); G. Syveton, *Louis XIV. et Charles XII.*, I. (*Revue d'Histoire Diplomatique*, 1898, 2); G. W. Prothero, *The Parlement of Paris* (*English Historical Review*, April); A. de Ganniers, *Le Maréchal de Luckner et la Première Campagne de Belgique en 1792, d'après les Documents du Dépôt de la Guerre* (*Revue des Questions Historiques*, April); F. Masson, *Les Bonaparte et le Consulat à Vie*, 1802 (*Revue de Paris*, February 15); Baron du Casse, *Le 5^e Corps de l'Armée d'Italie en 1859*, II. (*Revue Historique*, May).

ITALY, SPAIN, PORTUGAL.

Upon the basis of the voluminous police reports of 1814 and 1815 in the archives formerly belonging to the grand-duchy of Tuscany, Signor G. Marcotti, in his *Cronache Segrete della Polizia Toscana* (Florence, G. Barbéra) has constructed a valuable and interesting picture of political life and movements in Tuscany during those two important years.

From March 18 to April 10 an *Esposizione del Risorgimento* was held at Milan, intended to commemorate the fiftieth anniversary of the Five

Days. The municipal government, the Museo del Risorgimento, the Società Storica Lombarda, and other organizations co-operated in the commemoration, and in the exhibition of documents, books, pictures and relics illustrating the revolutionary events of 1846-1848.

Signor Cristoforo Manfredi has gathered out of the archives of the Italian general staff the material for an excellent book on *La Spedizione Sarda in Crimea nel 1855-56* (Rome, Enrico Voghera).

The house of Hoepli at Milan have brought out a second edition of Signor Francesco Bertolini's *Storia del Risorgimento Italiano*, to which the author has added two new chapters, on the relations between Italy and France since 1870 and on the colony of Eritrea respectively.

Upon the basis of a very ample collection of documentary materials, Don Manuel Danvila has begun the publication of an elaborate *Historia Crítica y Documentada de las Comunidades de Castilla*. The first volume (of six) has already appeared.

The eighth volume of Señor M. de Olivart's *Coleccion de Tratados, Convenios y Documentos Internacionales*, the second for the reign of Alfonso XII., presents, with the usual historical notes, the documents for the period extending from 1880 to November, 1885.

Señor W. E. Retana has published a third volume of his *Archivo del Bibliófilo Filipino* (Madrid, pp. 564), containing a general report on the Philippines made in 1583 by Domingo de Salazar, first bishop of the islands, an account of China and its relations to the Philippines, which the bishop sent to Philip II. in 1590, a description of the maps and plans of the islands possessed by the Archives of the Indies, and a further installment of Señor Retana's bibliography of the group.

Senhor Zeferino Brandão is preparing a careful monograph on the Prior of Crato and the conquest of Portugal by Philip II.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: J. Guiraud, *Rome, Ville Sainte au I^{er} Siècle* (Revue d'Histoire et de Littérature Religieuses, III. 1); K. Zeumer, *Geschichte der wisigothischen Gesetzgebung*, I. (Neues Archiv., XXIII., 2); W. F. Tilton, *The Fate of the Spanish Armada* (Century Magazine, June); F. P. Badham, *Nelson and the Neapolitan Republicans* (English Historical Review, April); A. Stern, *Der Versuch des Staatsstreiches Ferdinand VII. von Spanien im Juli 1822* (Historische Vierteljahrschrift, n. f., III. 1).

GERMANY, AUSTRIA, SWITZERLAND.

The "Versammlung deutscher Historiker" was held this year at Nuremberg, on April 11-13. The principal subjects discussed were the organization and accessibility of archives; the archives of the Vatican; the medieval colonization of eastern Germany; the origins of seigniorial property in Germany, etc.

The provincial historical commission for Styria has adopted a plan for the publication of a comprehensive work on the constitutional and

administrative history of that province, in a series of separate parts entitled *Forschungen zur Verfassungs- und Verwaltungsgeschichte der Steiermark*. Two parts have already appeared, a volume by Professor F. von Krones on the constitutional and administrative history of the mark and duchy from the earliest times to the accession of the Hapsburgs, and one by Fr. Ilwof on the counts of Attems.

Under the general editorship of Professor Richard Schröder the Prussian Academy of Sciences has entered upon the compilation of a comprehensive and scientific *Wörterbuch der deutschen Rechtssprache*.

A historical commission for Alsace-Lorraine has been established. The publication of a chronicle of Metz and of cartularies of Strassburg and Metz is contemplated.

P. Kalkoff, who has already published an annotated translation of the despatches of Aleander, has now printed in the *Schriften des Vereins für Reformationsgeschichte*, Heft 59 (Halle, Niemeyer), translations of the other contemporary accounts of Luther at Worms, written in other languages than German. They are accompanied with notes and introductions as to the various ambassadors, etc.

The association which has charge of the Zwingli Museum at Zurich has begun the publication of a semi-annual journal called *Zwingliana*, devoted to the history of Zwingli and of the Reformation.

M. Rodolphe Reuss has published, as a part of the Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études (Paris, Bouillon), the first of two volumes of a highly important history of *L'Alsace au XVII^e Siècle*, in which he intends to present a full and careful picture of the material, religious and moral life of that province from 1618 to 1697. The first volume treats with great impartiality the political history of the country and its subdivisions during the Thirty Years' War and the first years of the French rule, with minute attention to the history of the administration and of economic life.

Professor W. A. S. Hewins, of London, will probably have ready in the autumn a *History of German Commercial Policy*, based upon some of his lectures at the School of Economics.

The *Deutsche Revue* began in its February number the publication of a series of letters, important for the German history of the years from 1847 on, which passed between the Prince Consort Albert and Bunsen.

Students of modern German history will surely give a hearty welcome to the new biographical annual edited by A. Bettelheim and published at Berlin by G. Reimer, under the title *Biographisches Jahrbuch und Deutscher Nekrolog*. The first volume (pp. 77, 463) consists of two parts, the first containing various biographical matter and a bibliography of biography for the year 1896, while the second presents biographies, prepared with unusual care, of Germans who died in that year. The names are numerous, the principle of selection catholic, and the volume certain to be of permanent value.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: G. Seeliger, *Volksrecht und Königsrecht?* (Historische Vierteljahrschrift, n. f., III. 1); E. Dümmler, *Studien über Hrabanus Maurus* (Sitzungsberichte der k. preuss. Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1898, 3); F. von Bezold, *Die ältesten deutschen Universitäten in ihrem Verhältnis zum Staat* (Historische Zeitschrift, LXXX. 3); K. Müller, *König Sigmunds Geleit für Huss* (Historische Vierteljahrschrift, n. f., III. 1); H. Pechtl, *Joseph II. und die Staatsbeamten seiner Zeit*, I. (Zeitschrift für Kulturgeschichte, V. 4, 5).

AMERICA.

Mr. J. N. Larned, of the Buffalo Public Library, whose *History for Ready Reference* has found a place of much usefulness in many libraries, has undertaken, at the instance of Mr. George Iles, to prepare an annotated bibliography of American history, similar to that which Messrs. Sturgis and Krehbiel prepared for the literature of the fine arts. It is to comprise about a thousand titles, which, by the co-operation of expert scholars, will be accompanied with notes expressing an estimate of the character and value of each.

The house of Felix Alcan, of Paris, announces a *Histoire des États Unis d'Amérique*, by Professor Adolphe Cohn of Columbia University.

Mr. A. P. C. Griffin, assistant librarian of Congress, has prepared a valuable *List of Books relating to Cuba*, which has been printed as Senate Document No. 161 of the Second Session of the 55th Congress. It is accompanied with a bibliography of maps by Mr. P. Lee Phillips.

The concluding volume of the *Catalogue of the Rawlinson Manuscripts*, by Mr. W. D. Macray of the Bodleian Library, may be expected to contain much material relating to America, and an exhaustive index of persons, places and things mentioned in the five volumes now brought to conclusion.

Francis P. Harper, of New York, announces the commencement of a new series of historical works under the editorship of Dr. Elliott Coues, to be entitled *The American Explorers Series*. The first volume, now ready, is the Journal of Jacob Fowler, describing his travels from Fort Smith to the Rocky Mountains and back in the years 1821 and 1822. The second volume, to be issued in the autumn, will contain the personal narrative of Charles Larpenteur, for forty years a fur-trader on the upper Missouri.

In Vol. V. of the *Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature*, and in *Americana Germanica*, Vol. I. No. 4, Professor Kuno Francke exhibits a curious relation of German pietism to American history by printing a correspondence maintained by August Hermann Francke and Cotton Mather.

In the philological and literary series of the *Bulletin of the University of Wisconsin*, Dr. William B. Cairns, instructor in rhetoric in that university, presents an accurate and instructive essay of 87 pages *On the*

Development of American Literature from 1815 to 1833, with especial reference to periodicals, of which the appendix presents an exhaustive bibliographical list.

The seventh volume of the *Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents, 1789-1897*, published by authority of Congress, and edited by Mr. J. D. Richardson, covers the period from March 4, 1869, to March 4, 1881.

The fifth volume of the *Documentary Sources of the Publications of the Maine Historical Society*, now ready for delivery, comprises early documents relating to Maine. It is published under the editorial care of Mr. James Phinney Baxter.

The *Tenth Report on the Custody and Condition of the Public Records of parishes, towns and counties in Massachusetts*, by Mr. Robert T. Swan, Commissioner, contains, beside the usual matter, 189 pages of historical data relating to churches, parishes, precincts and religious societies, present and past, in Massachusetts.

In the *Proceedings of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences* for February, Mr. Andrew McFarland Davis has a scholarly paper entitled "Certain Considerations Concerning the Coinage of the Colony and Public Bills of Credit of the Province of Massachusetts Bay."

The *Life and Work of Thomas Dudley, the Second Governor of Massachusetts*, by Mr. Augustine Jones, is announced for publication by subscription by Messrs. Houghton, Mifflin and Co.

The Nantucket Historical Association has issued in a pamphlet of 96 pages, edited by Mr. Myron S. Dudley, the *Timothy White Papers, 1725-1755*. The documents are largely accounts and lists, but some letters and biographical memoranda are included. Timothy White was the organizer of the first Congregational Church in Nantucket, and was for many years its pastor, and a preacher to the Indians on the island, and a schoolmaster, and in some degree a business man, so that his records, along with Mr. Dudley's historical introduction, are an important contribution to the island's early history. Plates of the old North Vestry and of the interior plan of the first meeting-house accompany the volume.

The legal history of the Narragansett Indians and their relations to the colony and state of Rhode Island are treated with great learning in a pamphlet entitled *Opinion of the Justices of the Supreme Court relative to Chapter 800 of the Public Laws*, prepared by Mr. Justice Rogers, and printed by the state printers (pp. 85).

Dr. Thomas W. Bicknell announces an elaborate *History of the Town of Barrington, R. I., from the Visit of the Northmen to the Present Time*, to be published by the author at Providence, R. I.

The *Bulletin of the New York Public Library* has continued its careful calendar of the material in the Emmet collection relating to the signers of the Declaration of Independence and of the members of the

Continental Congress, as well as its texts of President Washington's copy-press letters. The February number gave a list of the manuscript accessions of the Library in 1895, 1896 and 1897. The April number contains a list of the periodicals, collections and society publications relating to American history and genealogy taken in the New York Public Library and in that of Columbia College, so extensive as to occupy 35 pages of print.

In the *Columbia University Bulletin* for March Dr. Harry A. Cushing begins a historical account of King's College in the Revolution.

The April number of the *Pennsylvania Magazine of History* contains, beside its continued articles, two pieces of very considerable value: the journal of Major Henry Livingston, of the third New York Continental Line, kept from August to December, 1775, now edited by Mr. Gaillard Hunt, of the Department of State, and a scholarly and valuable article by Mr. Oliver Hough on Capt. William Crispin, who was William Penn's commissioner for settling the colony in Pennsylvania, and whose activity, though confined to England, was of considerable importance in the early days of the province. Mr. Herbert Friedenwald's valuable account of the journals and papers of the Continental Congress was completed in the January number.

The April number of the *Publications* of the Southern History Association contains two articles of great interest: an elaborate account of the history of anti-slavery sentiment in the South, by Dr. Stephen B. Weeks, and a journal of a voyage to Charleston taken in 1765 by Pelatiah Webster.

The April number of the *William and Mary College Quarterly* contains a brief account of the legal history of the Northern Neck, papers on Indian slaves and various county committees, and the usual amount of genealogical matter.

The Davidson College Historical Association of Davidson, N. C., has begun the issue of a series of pamphlets called *Studies in History*. In the first number the most notable contents are an article by F. F. Rowe on the question, Was Marshal Ney in America? and an article on the battle of Ramsour's Mill by Gen. R. Barringer.

Mr. A. S. Salley, Jr., of Orangeburg, S. C., a most careful antiquary, has just brought out a *History of Orangeburg Co., S. C.*, extending through the Revolution (pp. 572) and giving especial attention to the social and military aspects of his subject.

In the *Johns Hopkins University Studies*, Mr. Henry E. Chambers presents an interesting and careful study of West Florida and its relation to the Historical Cartography of the United States.

The latest of the *Parkman Club Publications* are A Moses of the Mormons, an account of Stang, by Henry E. Legler; Claude Jean Allouez, Apostle of the Ottawas, by Joseph S. Laboule, and Negro Slavery in Wisconsin and the Underground Railroad, by John N. Davidson.

The State Historical Society of Wisconsin has issued an interesting little pamphlet containing the story of its growth and a description of its new building, accompanied by views and plans. The *Proceedings* of the Society at its Forty-fifth Annual Meeting contains, beside the usual record of enterprise and prosperity, a bibliographical account of the Wisconsin constitutional conventions by Miss Florence E. Baker, and a notice of Ichabod Coddling.

The Mercantile Library of St. Louis has printed in a small pamphlet of 22 pages a chronological list of its Missouri and Illinois newspapers, 1808 to 1897, and a calendar of its manuscripts relating to Missouri and Louisiana.

The *Quarterly of the Texas State Historical Association* contained in its January number an article on Cabeza de Vaca, suggesting a route for his journey differing from that usually accepted, by Miss Brownie Ponton and Mr. B. H. McFarland. Father E. J. P. Schmitt writes of the Sieur Louis de St. Denis, a subject which is resumed by Mr. L. G. Bugbee in the April number. The latter also contains a full account of the establishment of the University of Texas, by the president of the association, Judge O. M. Roberts.

Mr. W. F. McCaleb of Texas, fellow in the University of Chicago, has leave to spend much of next year in investigations in the archives of Mexico relating to the history of Texas before its revolution.

The Gammel Book Company, of Austin, Texas, has undertaken to reprint, in a complete edition, extending to ten volumes, the laws of Texas from 1822 to 1897.

Professor F. G. Young, of the University of Oregon, has begun the publication of a modest and useful series of pamphlets for the use of students and teachers in that state, entitled *Sources of the History of Oregon*. The first number consists of the journal of Medorem Crawford, who was prominent among the early settlers. It presents an account, apparently the only journal preserved, of the trip which the writer made across the plains with the Oregon pioneers of 1842 under the lead of Dr. Elijah White. The second number is a reprint of a journal of the Indian Council of Walla Walla, held in May and June, 1855. The journal, kept by Col. Lawrence Kip, U. S. A., was printed in a small edition in 1855. Brief introductions are supplied by the editor, whose venture is an eminently commendable and useful one.

M. Georges Pariset, professor in the University of Nancy, has prepared from the printed materials a careful study entitled *Histoire Sommaire du Conflit Anglo-Vénézuélien en Guyane, de 1493 à 1897* (Berger-Levrault, pp. 79).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: *Civil and Religious Liberty in the United States, 1600-1800* (London Quarterly, April); H. L. Osgood, *The American Revolution* (Political Science Quarterly, March); E. R. Johnson, *The Consular Service, 1776-1792* (Political Science Quarterly,

March); A. B. Hart, *A Century of Cuban Diplomacy* (Harper's Magazine, June); R. O. Crowley, *The Confederate Torpedo Service* (Century Magazine, June); A. Hiller, *History of the Lutheran Church in New Jersey* (Lutheran Quarterly, April).



Delicious Drink

Horsford's Acid Phosphate
with water and sugar only,
makes a delicious, healthful
and invigorating drink.

Allays the thirst, aids diges-
tion, and relieves the lassitude
so common in midsummer.

Dr. M. H. Henry, New York, says:
"When completely tired out by prolonged
wakefulness and overwork, it is of the
greatest value to me. As a beverage it
possesses charms beyond anything I know
of in the form of medicine."

Descriptive pamphlet free.
Rumford Chemical Works, Providence, R.I.
Beware of Substitutes and Imitations.

AMERICAN COLONIAL TRACTS ISSUED MONTHLY

A Magazine designed to repro-
duce, in convenient form,
and at a low price, the more im-
portant pamphlets relating to the
History of the American Colonies
before 1776, that have hitherto
been inaccessible by reason of
their scarcity and high price.
Single numbers are 25 cents each,
or yearly subscriptions, \$3.00.
Descriptive circulars will be
mailed on application.

PUBLISHED BY
GEORGE P HUMPHREY
ROCHESTER N Y



Old South Leaflets.

A New Leaflet containing all of Washington's letters to
the President of Congress relating to the capture of Boston in
1776 has just been published. The series is especially strong
in leaflets relating to Washington. This new leaflet on the
Capture of Boston is the tenth Washington leaflet, the others
being: Washington's Farewell Address, Washington's Inaugu-
rals, Washington's Circular Letter to the Governors of the
States in 1783, Washington's Letter to Benjamin Harrison on
the Opening of the West, Henry Lee's Funeral Oration on
Washington, Washington's Journal of his Tour to the Ohio in
1770, Washington's Account of the Army at Cambridge in 1775,
Washington's Addresses to the Churches, and Washington's
Words on a National University.

DIRECTORS OLD SOUTH WORK.
Old South Meeting House, Boston, Mass.

The Publishers of

THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW

are prepared to supply subscribers with a durable cover in which to bind the
completed volumes of the REVIEW.

The cover is made with morocco corners and back, and will be sent postpaid
upon receipt of 75 cents.

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY, 66 Fifth Ave., New York.

Works on European History, Etc.

By JOHN EDWARD
COURTENAY BODLEY, M.A. **FRANCE.**

IN TWO VOLUMES.
Medium Octavo, \$4.00, net.

Mr. Bodley aims to give a concise description of the country, its people and institutions.

The Times (London) calls it

"A work to be consulted by all who would understand the forces and movements in French life, . . . a work which is the worthy outcome of well spent years and which will take rank with Mr. Bryce's *America* and Sir D. M. Wallace's *Russia*, among the few books which enable nations to understand nations."

"We have in this work a most lucid, able, impartial and comprehensive treatment of the political situation in France. . .

"It contains an admirable account of the departments of government, of the various parties now in existence, and presents through every page a most luminous exposition not alone of the politics, but of the temper, feeling and genius of the French people."—*The Spectator*.

The Growth of the French Nation.

By GEORGE BURTON ADAMS, Professor of History in Yale University. Originally prepared especially for the use of members of the Chautauqua Circles. Cloth, 12mo. Price, \$1.25.

"Mr. Adams has dealt in a fascinating way with the chief features of the Middle Age, and his book is rendered the more attractive by some excellent illustrations. He traces the history of France from the Conquests by the Romans and Franks down to the presidency of M. Félix Faure, and has always something to say that is clear and to the point."—*From the Educational Review*.

Of Interest to Students of English History and Politics.

THE NATIONAL MOVEMENT IN THE REIGN OF HENRY III.,

And Its Culmination in the Barons' War.

By OLIVER H. RICHARDSON, Professor of History in Drury College, Missouri. 12mo. Cloth, \$1.50 net.

This brief history, designed for a student's book of reference, will interest the reading public by its popular literary style.

THE ENGLISH CONSTITUTION.

A Commentary on its Nature and Growth.

By JESSE MACY, M.A., Professor of Political Science in Iowa College. 12mo. Cloth, \$2.00 net.

An excellent introduction to Bryce's *American Commonwealth*, supplying a knowledge of English political institutions.

A New Volume in the Periods of European History Series.

General Editor, ARTHUR HASSALL, Oxford University.

Period IV, 1494-1598

By A. H. JOHNSON, M.A. 12mo, cloth. Price, \$1.75 net.

VOLUMES PREVIOUSLY ISSUED:

Period I. A. D. 476-918. By C. W. C. OMAN, M.A., Fellow of All Souls' College, Oxford. \$1.75 net.

Period V. A. D. 1598-1715. By H. O. WAKEMAN, M.A., Keble College, Oxford. \$1.40 net.

Period VII. A. D. 1789-1815. By H. MORSE STEVENS, M.A., Cornell University. \$1.40 net.

Send for a circular of the series or the new Catalogue of Books on History, Biography, etc., to the publishers,

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY, 66 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK.

